

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. XLIX

OCTOBER, 1951

NO. 1066

Where We Stand Today

EDWARD CARDINAL MOONEY

Archbishop of Detroit

Address at Marygrove College, Detroit, Mich., May 15, 1951.

TO BE here this evening is a significant and heartening experience. For we find speakers representing the viewpoints of government, management, labor and the Church gathered together to discuss the problems of our modern industrial society in the light of two great religious documents on the application of Christian moral principles to social and industrial life. Such a gathering would have been inconceivable sixty years ago when Leo XIII published his encyclical *Rerum Novarum* on the condition of labor. It would have been astonishing, to say the least, twenty years ago when Pius XI issued his encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* on

"Reconstructing the Social Order and perfecting it conformably to the precepts of the Gospel." Tonight this gathering has its counterpart in industrial centers across the country.

In evaluating the import of what has been said here tonight it is pertinent to note the progress that has been made during the past sixty years in the solution of some critical social problems. This encouraging progress is evident in specific measures enacted into Federal and State legislation, as well as in practices adopted by voluntary agreement of the parties concerned. Here we might instance minimum wage legislation, the legal enforcement of labor's right

to organize, workmen's compensation laws, government insurance for the hazards of unemployment and old age, restrictions against child labor, the recognition of the role of government in protecting the public interest through the establishment of mediation agencies for industrial disputes, the provision of public housing for low-income groups, control of monopolies through government regulation of public utilities rates, and contractual provisions which aim at keeping wages in balance with the rising cost of living.

There are evidences of progress, too, in the attitudes of management, labor and the public that create a better atmosphere for the solution of economic problems. There is, I like to think, a wider recognition of the supremacy of moral principles in economic life. There is a growing tendency to annul the divorce of ethics from economics that was all too generally accepted in the 19th century. This is connected with the clearer perception of the truth that industrial relations are human relations—which by definition come within the compass of the moral law.

THE COMMON GOOD

A determining factor in this improved attitude is found in the development of the doctrine of social justice as a virtue which deals not with the duties of man to man and group to group but with the recip-

rocal duties of individuals and groups in relation to the common good. Contemporary emphasis on social justice brings out the truth that just dealings between man and man or group and group will not alone solve our modern social problems. We must keep in view the common good and promote organized effort towards its accomplishment.

The natural effect of an explicit development of the doctrine of social justice is an increased awareness of the social responsibility of industrial management and union leadership. Here in Detroit it was gratifying to see the recent statement of the head of a great corporation in recognition of its social responsibility. On the part of powerful unions, too, we have had evidence of a sincere desire to work with management for the promotion of economic prosperity and peace. This is confirmed by the now general recognition of responsible union leaders that Communists in their membership represent a sinister and disruptive influence which has to be watched and, by democratic action, effectively curbed.

If I may digress for a moment from a brief review of the recent past to an expression of hope for the immediate future, I would note that only a deeper inculcation of a sincere and active sense of social responsibility in every member of a union can bring freedom from the twin plagues of the unauthorized strike and the

paralyzing apathy of good men who could, but do not, exercise a salutary influence in their union. And in the critical months ahead it is only a strong and unselfish sense of social responsibility on the part of both management and labor that can fulfill our hopes for united and effective action, under the guidance of government as the guardian of the common good, to avoid the national calamity of disastrous inflation.

I have noted gratifying signs of progress discernible in specific measures and attitudes that serve to eliminate some of the glaring social evils condemned in the encyclicals we commemorate tonight. It is regrettable, however, that in this country little progress can be recorded in carrying out or even seriously studying the broad program of the encyclicals for the establishment, on sound moral principles, of a social order which will give consistent form and shape to economic life. This program of social reconstruction is the core of the encyclicals and few have penetrated to it—few even amongst those who sincerely appreciate the high moral tone and the insistence on cooperation rather than conflict which stand out in these documents so that he who runs may read.

Pius XI, rounding out the social principles formulated by Leo XIII, envisages not merely casual or intermittent cooperation between capital and labor during periods of stress or difficulty in their relations, but regular and permanently organized cooperation that runs the whole gamut of social and economic life. His program calls for a whole series of inter-related organizations—industrial, agricultural and professional—freely set up by representatives of the groups concerned, under the supervision, *but not the control*, of government, not only for the furtherance of their own interests but for the discharge of their duty as parts of an organic social body whose dominant interest is the common good.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

What the encyclicals propose is a broad program, not a set of blue prints with complete specifications attached. It is, therefore, adaptable to the genius of a nation and the nature of its political, social and economic institutions. It is a long-range program to be realized by evolution not revolution. Its development, therefore, can begin with consciously encouraged and energetically fostered cooperation between existing organi-

zations of management, labor, agriculture and the professions. Its ultimate aim is not to destroy these groups but to integrate them into an expanded, ordered and federated force for the achievement of social justice and the promotion of the common good.

This program charts a middle course between the two opposed social systems that contend for favor in the modern world. On the one side we have those who stand for collectivism in economics and absolutism in government. The logic of events has shown that Communism, Fascism and Nazism, while apparently in conflict, represent two views of the same sordid reality—statism with its absolute economic control and its ruthless suppression of human freedom.

On the other side we have economic individualism in its various forms, either in its original "ruggedness" or in any of its mitigated forms. The common characteristic of all economic individualism is its lack of a consistent and integrated social philosophy and its historic tendency to produce social conflict rather than to foster social cooperation.

CORNERSTONES

In contrast to the extremes of statism and individualism the encyclicals propose a comprehensive and constructive program of social order which takes into account the dignity of the human person, the

fundamental right to private property, the social nature of man and the realities of economic life. The cornerstones of the social edifice which this program envisions are:

1. The Law of God which our Creator has written in the heart of man and confirmed in revelation, the moral law which is the rule of reason with its developed concepts of social justice and social charity.

2. The fundamental concept of reason and faith which regards society as an organic whole with articulated, interacting parts.

3. The principle of ordered freedom under God as against governmental absolutism.

4. The alluring ideal of social cooperation as against the harsh realities of social conflict.

It is a program that fits in with all that is best in our American tradition and our distinctive institutions; for it exalts the religious and moral principles that lie at the very root of our democratic freedoms and give substance to the responsibilities of citizenship in a representative democracy. It is in line, too, with our ideas of the function of government. For the Constitution empowers the Federal Government to "*establish justice*," but uses a significantly different term when it authorizes it "*to promote the general welfare*." This implied distinction is recalled by the words used by Pius XI to describe the relations of government to the freely

established vocational groups that are basic in his program. His idea is that the part of government in social organization is to stimulate, to guide, to restrain, but not to dominate.

Surely it is appropriate on an occasion of this kind to bespeak for the encyclical program of social order dispassionate consideration and calm, open discussion in an atmosphere of good will and in a disposition to seek solutions for our social problems by agreement rather than by force,

whether political or economic. I feel that we can rightly call upon all men of religious faith and principle, both in management and labor, to take the lead in studying and working out, gradually if need be, a constructive program of this kind in a way that takes account of our economic conditions and our basic national institutions. For the moral and social ideals it aims to implement are the heritage of men of faith who cherish freedom, love justice, exalt charity and follow after peace.



Beyond the Wage Contract

First of all, those who declare that a contract of hiring and being hired is unjust of its own nature, and hence a partnership-contract must take its place, are certainly in error and gravely misrepresent Our Predecessor whose encyclical not only accepts working for wages or salaries but deals at some length with its regulation in accordance with the rules of justice.

We consider it more advisable, however, in the present condition of human society that, so far as is possible, the work-contract be somewhat modified by a partnership-contract, as is already being done in various ways and with no small advantage to workers and owners. Workers and other employes thus become sharers in ownership or management or participate in some fashion in the profits received.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 64, 65.



The Catholic Press

Its foremost duty is to foster in various attractive ways an ever better understanding of social doctrine. It should, too, supply accurate and complete information on the activity of the enemy and the means of resistance which have been found most effective in various quarters.—*On Atheistic Communism*, N. 56.

The Achievement of Rerum Novarum

HENRY SOMERVILLE, K.C.S.G.

Editor, *The Canadian Register*

Reprinted from THE CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART*

THE Catholic Church is always guided by the Holy Spirit, and anything that is truly a movement of the Church must be directed by Divine Providence. There is a growing tendency in the Church to commemorate the anniversaries of the publication of the encyclical letter *Rerum Novarum* by Pope Leo XIII in May, 1891. The anniversaries that come at the end of a decade are celebrated with special solemnity. The fortieth anniversary was honored by the issue of the encyclical letter *Quadragesimo Anno* by Pope Pius XI, which rivals *Rerum Novarum* itself in interest and in importance; and the fiftieth anniversary, which came during the Second World War, was the occasion of and the subject of a radio address to the world by the present Holy Father.

On the fiftieth anniversary Pope Pius XII spoke of calling to the attention of the Catholic world "a memory worthy of being written in letters of gold on the calendar of the Church: the fiftieth anniversary of the publication on May 15, 1891, of the epoch-making social encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*." On the fortieth anniversary

Pope Pius XI called it "the incomparable encyclical . . . this remarkable document of pastoral solicitude" which "the whole Catholic world gratefully recalls and prepares to celebrate with befitting solemnity."

The epoch-making character of *Rerum Novarum* is not shown on its surface to every reader today. Those who go to it expecting to find something new and startling are disappointed. They find teachings with which they are already familiar, and which they may even consider commonplace; and, instead of regarding the encyclical letter as "advanced"—to use a favorite label of current jargon—they may be inclined to class it as conservative. The present familiarity of the teaching of *Rerum Novarum* is evidence of its success; it has permeated and formed Catholic thought, and even non-Catholic thought, in considerable degree since its first publication. Pope Leo XIII affirmed the right of the worker to a living wage, the right to form labor unions, and the duty of the State to intervene with legislation for the welfare and the protection of the masses of the people. All democratic govern-

* 2 Dale Avenue, Toronto, Ont., Canada, May, 1951.

ments and parties have now accepted these principles and have adopted measures which attempt to apply these principles. A reader may conclude that *Rerum Novarum* deals with goals that have now been reached, though they had not been reached sixty years ago.

THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL MOVEMENT

Such a view of *Rerum Novarum* would show a great lack of knowledge of the past and an equal lack of appreciation of what is going on at present. For at present there is a Catholic social movement in the world, with its Catholic social doctrine, which is the only vital and coherent alternative to that other world social movement which is called Communism. Pope Leo XIII did not initiate the Catholic social movement, for he had precursors such as Frederick Ozanam in France, Bishop Ketteler in Germany, Cardinal Manning in England, to mention only three; but Pope Leo XIII, in a series of encyclicals, most of all in *Rerum Novarum*, gave the Catholic social movement a pontifical charter, its authorization and its guide.

In Western European countries today which are still free and democratic—Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, France, Italy—there are powerful political parties which are Catholic in inspiration. These quasi-Catholic parties are the only non-Socialist parties which have a wide pop-

ular appeal. But for these Catholic parties, as they may be called without serious inaccuracy, the masses of workers in those countries would all be in Socialist parties, and the Socialist parties in those countries were all originally of Marxist inspiration and are still deeply influenced by Marxist traditions. The Catholic parties, without which the working-classes of continental Europe would have succumbed to Communism, were products of the Catholic social movement which owes it prestige and strength to *Rerum Novarum*.

In English-speaking countries also the Catholic social movement has had the happy result of keeping the Catholic workers faithful to the Church and of enabling Catholics to work harmoniously with the general labor movements. Never since the Reformation have there been so many Catholics in the British Government and in the House of Commons as in these days of Labor majorities. In Australia and New Zealand the Labor parties have long and frequently held office in government, and Catholics have held leading positions. In the United States and Canada there have been good relations between the Church and the labor unions, in which Catholics hold some of the most important offices. All this has been made possible because the Church, most notably in *Rerum Novarum*, has shown her sympathy with legitimate labor aspirations.

NINETEENTH-CENTURY "LIBERALISM"

The 19th century, the century of Pope Leo XIII, saw the dominance of Secularist Liberalism, which for English-speaking readers might better be called Secularist Individualism, because in Britain, Ireland and Canada the name Liberal was used for political parties which were no more secularist than their opponents, and good Catholics attached themselves to Liberal parties without incurring any reproach from the Church. But the name Liberal has to be used for the secularist individualists, because that is the name they adopted for themselves, and it is the name used by the Popes in referring to them. Thus Pope Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* says of *Rerum Novarum* that "it boldly attacked and overthrew the idols of Liberalism," that it "overthrew those tottering tenets of Liberalism which had long hampered effective interference by the government," and that Leo XIII "sought help neither from Liberalism nor from Socialism; the former had already shown its utter impotence to find a right solution of the social question, while the latter would have exposed human society to still graver dangers by offering a remedy much more disastrous than the evil it designed to cure."

These references to the antitheses, Liberalism and Socialism, are the key

to the understanding of the historic importance of *Rerum Novarum*. Liberalism was the established creed and system of the 19th century, dominating and forming political and economic life. Socialism was its great critic, adversary, rival. There seemed to be no other alternative to logical minds. True that there were different shades or degrees of Liberalism, and also of Socialism, and there were plenty of people inclined to be middle-of-the-roads, compromising by taking a bit of one and giving up a bit of the other. But the compromisers and appeasers were only opportunists; they lacked definite principles; they were not guiding the boat, but were carried along by the currents.

OTHER LEONINE ENCYCLICALS

With important qualifications to be indicated below it may be said fairly that the nineteenth-century battle between Liberalism and Socialism has developed into the twentieth-century struggle between Capitalism and Communism. Pope Leo XIII was an acute observer and a profound thinker who understood what was going on. If we are to appreciate his greatness, we must read all his social encyclical letters, not only *Rerum Novarum*. Immediately on his accession to the Throne of Peter in the spring of 1878 he issued a short encyclical letter entitled: *On the Evils Affecting Modern Society: Their Causes and*

Remedies. He showed his preoccupation with social questions, though not particularly with economic questions. He diagnosed the root of the modern evils as Secularism, the rejection of the authority of the Church. Again, during the first year of his pontificate, Leo XIII issued a second short encyclical letter entitled: *Concerning Modern Errors: Socialism, Communism, Nihilism*. The Cominform was not yet existing, but, as a prediction of what we know in our time, read the following from the first page of an encyclical letter written in 1878:

We are alluding to that sect of men who, under the motley and all but barbarous terms and titles of Socialists, Communists and Nihilists, are spread abroad throughout the world and, bound intimately together in baneful alliance, no longer look for strong support in secret meetings held in darksome places, but, standing forth openly and boldly in the light of day, strive to carry out the purpose, long resolved upon, of uprooting the foundations of civilized society at large.

This second encyclical letter of 1878 deals more than the first, but still only slightly, with economic questions, warning rulers that the misery suffered by the laboring masses was giving the Communist International (then called the Socialist International) its opportunity. The present-day division between Socialists and Communists had not yet taken place. The Pope's main concern in this encyclical is to implore gov-

ernments to support instead of supplanting religious influences in civil life, especially in the domains of marriage and education. In 1880 there was an encyclical dealing entirely with marriage, affirming particularly that marriage is not simply a civil affair, but is sacramental, and therefore under the jurisdiction of the Church. The appalling matrimonial laxity at the present day in many countries is the result of the denial of Church authority in this matter. In 1885 there was the encyclical, *The Christian Constitution of States*, which goes particularly into the question of the relations between Church and State. The Pope is combating the prevailing Secularism which would allow no public functions or authority to the Church, reducing it to the status of a mere private society with no rights except those that the State allowed to it.

In 1888 there was the encyclical letter, *Human Liberty*, a reasoned refutation of the Liberalism and the Secularism which were then as Siamese twins. Since that time Secularism has continued to flourish, but Liberalism has withered, and its place has been taken by various forms of totalitarianism or dictatorship.

LIBERALISM AND ITS ASCENDANCY

I have been writing so far of Liberalism without attempting to define it. Liberalism stood for reducing authority to the minimum and extend-

ing individual liberty to the maximum. In the philosophical field it stood for the sufficiency of the human reason in the search for truth, disregarding or denying revelation. In the religious field it denied all authority to the Church and asserted the right of every individual to believe and to teach what he liked, with complete separation between Church and State. In the political field it had to recognize that the State must have some authority, but it derived that authority purely from human sources, from "the people," which often meant merely a majority of voters with a property qualification. In the economic field it exalted free enterprise in the pursuit of profit, and it restricted to the minimum the exercise of State powers for the promotion of social welfare or the protection of particular classes. Liberalism took a very optimistic view of individual human nature, of the self-sufficiency of the individual, of his power to attain his welfare independently of divine and even of human authority.

The marvelous scientific and material progress of the 19th century was attributed, with plausibility, to this system of "liberty." Liberalism had to its credit the overthrow of political régimes and class-privileges which had outlived their period of social utility. Wealth was growing and, it seemed to many eyes, freedom was slowly broadening down from precedent to precedent. We must remember

these things if we are to understand the firm hold of Liberalism on the minds of the upper and the middle classes in the 19th century. Multitudes of Catholics belonging to these classes shared more or less in these views.

Yet there was another and a darker side to the picture which escaped the attention of the satisfied classes. The poorer classes, who were the majority, did not share in the boasted progress, or, if they did, it was not as a result of "liberty," which often meant the abolition of ancient controls established for their benefit; it was the result of their struggles in trade-unions and political parties against the propertied classes. There were formidable revolts time after time in different countries throughout the 19th century. Marx and Engels could write in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1849: "A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of Communism." The revolt movements did not always call themselves by that name; in England, for example, the revolt was called Chartism; but Communism knew how to turn all such revolts to its account. From the terrible Paris Commune of 1871 to the Russian Revolution of 1917 the name Communist had fallen out of use; the Marxists called themselves Socialists, a name used by non-Marxists also. The point to be noted is that the modern economic order called Capitalism, whose philosophy has been Liberalism, al-

ways has been under challenge from the classes which regarded it as a system of oppression. Over a large part of the world the Communist challengers are now victorious.

Pope Leo XIII, as we have seen, emphasized the gravity of the challenge in 1878, as soon as he became Pope. He issued a long series of encyclicals warning modern society of its danger. He never indulged in complacent rhapsodies over material progress, the spread of education and democracy. Not that he was unfriendly to democracy. He advised the French monarchists to accept the Republic and to try to make it a good Republic instead of vainly conspiring for a restoration of monarchy. He did not want to go back to old political forms, but the cry of all his encyclicals before 1891 was: "Back to the rule of religion in education, family life and public life." In *Rerum Novarum* he did something different, though fully consistent with his past teachings: he dealt particularly with the labor question and put himself at the head of a forward movement.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL PIONEER

There always had been Catholics who pointed out how the workers were victimized under the capitalist system and who urged radical reforms to control "free enterprise." Among the Catholic reformers we find those who wanted some kind of restoration of the medieval guild sys-

tem; some who wanted legal protection of the workers, nowadays called social security; some were strongly for cooperative societies; some were special champions of labor unions. These Catholic reformers met with vehement opposition from fellow Catholics who had imbibed the spirit of Liberalism, especially with regard to economic affairs, who were attached to the prevailing property system by their interests, and who thought that the Catholic reformers were infected by Socialism, closely akin to Communism. Indeed some of the Catholic reformers did lean toward Socialism.

The ultra-conservative Catholics (which in this connection means Catholics favorable to Economic Liberalism) were often very good people. They believed in the duty of charity, and some of them were munificent in their charities. They sincerely dreaded labor unions as hotbeds of revolution; they feared social legislation as "Statism" destructive of private enterprise and personal responsibility. In those days the science of Political Economy taught the beneficence of free competition as a sacred truth. All the governments and all the universities held the dogma that it was unscientific to allow any hindrances to free competition. Among sincere and social-minded Catholics there were sharp differences as to labor unions and State interference with freedom of contract.

The encyclical letter *Rerum Novarum* was not simply a restatement of traditional Catholic principles; it was, in part, an authoritative decision on questions disputed among Catholics as well as non-Catholics. Leo XIII, in several parts of the encyclical, takes care to argue the case for the Church, speaking on these economic questions which many thought to be outside her domain. I permit myself to quote the first paragraph of the encyclical, because it describes the social situation of the world as Leo XIII saw it. Readers may consider how it compares with the situation today, sixty years later:

That the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been disturbing the nations of the world, should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of economics is not surprising. The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable, in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvelous discoveries of science; in the changed relations between masters and workmen; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals and the utter poverty of the masses; in the increased self-reliance and closer combination of the working-classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing moral degeneracy. The momentous gravity of the state of things now obtaining fills every mind with apprehension; wise men are discussing it; practical men are proposing schemes; popular meetings, legislatures and rulers of all nations are busied with it—and actually there is no question which has taken a deeper hold on the public mind.

Thus *Rerum Novarum* began by declaring that the spirit of revolution was abroad; the prospective economic revolution was related to the political revolutions (such as the French) already accomplished; and the crisis was not attributed to agitators or other culpable individuals, but to social conditions both physical and moral. The evils of the existing system were described, and the proffered remedy of State Socialism examined and rejected. A program of social reforms (not simply individual reform) was set forth. State intervention to protect the workers against the abuses of capital was approved. This was a decisive judgment on a question which had divided Catholics. The principle of labor organizations was firmly upheld, though with grave warnings against irreligious leadership.

CONSTRUCTIVE PRINCIPLE

The most significant part of *Rerum Novarum* was the doctrine of the worker's right to a living wage as a minimum set by the natural moral law to the operation of free contract and the working of supply and demand. Even more than by his favor to State intervention Pope Leo XIII here set himself to overthrow what Pope Pius XI was to call the idols of Liberalism. Freedom of contract and the law of supply and demand were the sacred cows of nearly all the lawyers, the politicians, the economists

and the businessmen of the time. The Pope had based the right to a living wage on the nature of man as a rational and responsible creature of God, on the dignity of the human person. Liberalism had begun as an affirmation of the rights of man, but it became a sacrifice of the weak to the strong, and of human welfare to the accumulation of wealth. Socialism in reacting against selfish individualism denied to individuals private property—the apparatus of personality and the condition of liberty.

Every heresy, it has been said, is an exaggeration of some truth, and there was some truth as well as deadly errors in Liberalism and in Socialism. Experience has taught both Liberals and Socialists to see some of their errors, and many who bear those appellations can now recognize that Catholic social teaching has preserved the golden mean and is not ar

illogical compromise. The principle of the dignity of the human person, which guides Catholic social thinking, is one which can appeal to non-Catholics of good will. On the basis of this principle a truly human social order can be built, and must be built, if we are to avoid Communist or other totalitarianism.

Rerum Novarum committed the Church to this constructive social task, setting up her ideals for the factory as well as for the home and the school. Succeeding Popes have developed the work of Pope Leo XIII. It no longer causes wonder that encyclical letters are sociological as well as theological documents. The Catholic social movement is an essential part of the apostolate of the Church at the present day. The Catholic social movement throughout the world celebrates *Rerum Novarum* as its pontifical charter.



Regulation and Ownership

When the State brings private ownership into harmony with the needs of the common good, it does not commit a hostile act against private owners but rather does them a friendly service; for it thereby effectively prevents the private possession of goods, which the Author of nature in His most wise providence ordained for the support of human life, from causing intolerable evils and thus rushing to its own destruction; it does not destroy private possessions, but safeguards them; and it does not weaken private property rights, but strengthens them.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 49.

After Sixty Years

THE REV. GEORGE G. HIGGINS

Assistant Director, Social Action Dept., NCWC

Reprinted from SOCIAL ORDER*

“IT IS difficult for us to comprehend,” says Professor Girvetz of the University of California, “the hostility with which the Middle Ages regarded the pursuit of gain.”¹ It is equally difficult, however, to comprehend how completely this “hostility” to “the pursuit of gain” had been dissipated by the time of *Rerum Novarum*. The profit motive, to be sure, was present in the hearts of medieval men and women and to some extent at least was licensed by the social institutions of the times. Nevertheless, while it may be “proper to insist on the prevalence of avarice and greed in high places,” as Professor Tawney remarks with reference to the Middle Ages, “it is not less important to observe that men called these vices by their right names, and had not learned to persuade themselves that greed was enterprise and avarice, economy.”²

By May 15, 1891, however, Christians had been calling these “vices” by wrong names for centuries and might be said to have come

almost as close to sinning against the Holy Ghost as the Communists have done in more recent and more tragic decades. Even the best of Catholics, let us honestly confess, have been tortuously slow to understand that the economic “morality” of the centuries that made *Rerum Novarum* (and *The Communist Manifesto*?) inevitable was not only unnatural but sacrilegious as well, to the extent that economic selfishness was rationalized and honored for a virtue, as have been divorce and birth control in our days.

RERUM NOVARUM UNHEEDED

The failure of the Christian world to respond appropriately to *Rerum Novarum* (a *felix culpa* in that it elicited *Quadragesimo Anno* and thus advanced Christian social teaching) was a failure of the intellect as well as of the will. For generations many Christians, even when they were acting in the marketplace honestly and in all sincerity, were unmindful of the fact that they were living in the

¹ Harry K. Girvetz, *From Wealth to Welfare*, Stanford University Press, p. 5.

² R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, p. 61.

* 3115 S. Grand Blvd., St. Louis 18, Mo., May, 1951.

presence of the devil, who is happy, of course, when the children of men do the right thing for the wrong reason, but even happier, we may presume, when they do the wrong thing and persuade themselves that they are being virtuous.

Imperfectly as our own generation has responded to the social teachings of the Church, it is almost impossible for us to imagine how completely the philosophy of economic liberalism (which made social virtues out of private vices) had permeated the culture of the 19th century. This is merely another way of saying that it is almost impossible for the present generation of Americans to appreciate how revolutionary *Rerum Novarum* must have seemed, even to the best of Catholics, at the end of the 19th century. Pius XI was not exaggerating when he said that *Rerum Novarum* had "boldly attacked and overturned the idols of Liberalism, ignored long-standing prejudices, and was in advance of its time beyond all expectations."³

Quadragesimo Anno was equally revolutionary in its implications and equally in advance of its time, as we now realize more clearly than we did in 1931. *Rerum Novarum*, if we may say so respectfully and at the con-

scious risk of being misunderstood, was important principally as the precursor of *Quadragesimo Anno*. The "idols of Liberalism" had to be overturned before the more positive and more fully developed program of "reconstructing social order" and "perfecting it in conformity with the law of the Gospel"⁴ could be successfully launched. How successfully is another matter, which can be intelligently considered only after we have re-evaluated the two encyclicals, however cursorily, in the light of the economic history of the past sixty years.

Leo XIII, as Pius XI was to remind us in *Quadragesimo Anno*, "sought no help from either Liberalism or Socialism, for the one had proved that it was utterly unable to solve the social problem aright, and the other, proposing a remedy far worse than the evil itself, would have plunged human society into greater dangers."⁵ Forty years later these two contradictory, but complementary, extremes had been modified of course, in certain respects—sometimes for better, sometimes for worse—but they had not yet been exorcised from the body politic. Thus it became the unpleasant duty of Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno*—a duty ren-

³ Pope Pius XI, *On Reconstructing the Social Order*, an English translation of *Quadragesimo Anno* authorized by the Holy See, National Catholic Welfare Conference, n. 14.

⁴ *Idem.*, from the Introduction to the encyclical.

⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 10.

dered all the more distasteful, as he tells us, because of the apathy and even the hostility of many of the elect—to reemphasize the negative as well as to elaborate upon the more positive aspects of *Rerum Novarum*.⁶

In commemorating the joint anniversary of these two encyclicals, which "history will undoubtedly record" as being "among the most important moral pronouncements of recent centuries,"⁷ perhaps we may safely risk the danger of oversimplification by suggesting that the negative side of their teaching is now at least negatively accepted in the United States. Not completely, to be sure, but to this extent, at least, that whereas it was respectable in 1891, and to a lesser degree perhaps in 1931, to advocate the philosophy of *laissez faire* more or less in the raw, it is scarcely possible to do so in 1951.

"LIBERALISM" NOT DEAD

It is not to be inferred from this, of course, that the "liberalism" whose "idols" Leo XIII "boldly attacked"

in 1891 is now altogether extinct in the United States. Norman Thomas is probably correct in suggesting that "The Second World War gave the final deathblow to the capitalism of Adam Smith . . .,"⁸ but presumably there are those amongst us who still have hopes of resuscitating it in one form or another, at least as a respectable philosophy of economic life. "If an army of mere soldiers," says Professor Girvetz, "can find more than one route to Berlin and Seoul, an army of theorists and politicians should be able to find more than one route to Manchester."⁹ Indeed the reconnaissance troops are already in action, he suggests, and there is a certain amount of cheering from the civilian sidelines. The popularity among laymen, he says, "of works by such stalwart friends of the free market as Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich A. Hayek, Walter Lippmann, (sic!) Henry Simons, John Jewkes, and Lionel Robbins suggests . . ." that if *laissez faire* is "a skeleton, it is by no means in the closet."¹⁰

Be that as it may—and Girvetz, it probably ought to be added, is

⁶ For a brief summary of the "new" features of *Quadragesimo Anno*, see: John A. Ryan, *Social Doctrine in Action*, Harper & Brothers, pp. 242-246.

⁷ From an official statement entitled, *Encyclical Anniversary*, issued February 21, 1951, by the Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Episcopal Chairman of the Social Action Department, NCWC.

⁸ Norman Thomas, *A Socialist's Faith*, Norton, p. 159.

⁹ Harry K. Girvetz, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

¹⁰ *Idem.*, p. 121. See also, in this connection, a review by Father Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., of *The Key to Peace* by Clarence Manion (*America*, 84 [March 24, 1951], 728): "... Dean Manion grafts on to his theory a doctrine of extreme individualism . . . which, almost as expressed in the terms of this book, was roundly condemned by Pius XI."

rather inclined to stretch the definition of *laissez faire* to include almost any kind of opposition to the "welfare state"—*laissez faire*, either as a theory or a fact, is no longer the central issue that it was in 1891 and for 40-odd years thereafter. For all practical purposes, its plausibility as a workable and/or ethical philosophy of economic life has been irremediably damaged.

SOCIALISM WEAKENED

The same generalization, *mutatis mutandis*, may be hazarded with respect to Socialism, so far as the United States is concerned. Socialism hasn't died in the United States, if only for the reason that it was never born. Those who claim to have found it lurking in the purlieus of official Washington or in the council chambers of the national CIO are not always taken as seriously as they think they are, even by their own intimate associates. Significantly enough, they are prophets without honor even in the otherwise hospitable pages of *Fortune*. "Never have left-wing ideologies had so little influence on the American labor movement as they have today," the editors of *Fortune* concluded very recently. "The Communists still control a small but strategic sector of American labor," they are willing to admit, "and have scattered but dangerous beach-

heads elsewhere, notably in the Ford local of the automobile workers. But in glaring contrast to twenty or even to ten years ago, the Communists stay in control only by claiming to be 'bona fide unionists'; the mask is dropped only in the closed conventicles of the faithful."

They continue:

David Dubinsky pointed out last May that the old radical, socialist and idealist movements which formerly were the source of union leaders have been drying up. There are no Wobblies today, no Jewish Bund, no Italian anarchists, no Debs, no Mother Jones. If there is any ideological influence in American labor today it is Catholic union theory—spread by a growing number of labor priests and Catholic labor schools and of considerable importance in several C.I.O. unions as well as in the building trades of the A.F. of L.¹¹

Neither *laissez faire* nor Socialism, therefore, is the problem of the moment, so far as the United States is concerned. As we have already indicated, we can reasonably conclude on the sixtieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* and the twentieth of *Quadragesimo Anno*—as we could not have concluded in 1931, for example—that, for all practical purposes, public worship of the "idols of Liberalism" in the United States is a thing of the past (however much they may be honored between the covers of learned books), and we can be grateful, indeed, that they have not

¹¹ "The U. S. Labor Movement," *Fortune*, 21 (1951) 93.

yet been replaced by the equally meretricious idols of Socialism.¹²

If we have made such significant progress in the United States since, and to a large extent because of, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*; if we have escaped or are on the verge of escaping from the deadly thralldom of economic liberalism in its more unmitigated forms; and if in the process we have also managed to resist the blandishments of Socialism; we have every reason to be grateful, but by the same token we have no reason at all to lapse into complacency.

Most of our advances, it would probably be fair to say, have been preparatory in nature. We have turned our backs willy-nilly on the 19th century, but it remains to be seen which way we shall finally decide to go in the second half of the 20th. Our last state could conceivably be worse than our first if we were to rest on our laurels and permit the superficial prosperity of a defense

economy to distract our attention from the unfinished business of the encyclicals, which is the establishment of the social order. We do not have a "social order" in the encyclical sense of the word. We have a mixed and rather highly collectivized economy without any clearly established principle of unity and authority.

"*Laissez-faire* economics," says Norman Thomas, "has yielded supremacy even in America to a high degree of confused collectivism . . .,"¹³ not because "Socialists" or government "bureaucrats" have planned it that way, we hasten to add, but basically because economic liberalism inevitably and "of its own nature" results in "the concentration of power and might, the characteristic mark, as it were, of contemporary economic life. . . ."¹⁴

SEEK PRIVATE REGULATION

This "confused collectivism" obviously will not remain "confused" indefinitely. It will either be reorgan-

¹² For an effective antidote to the prevalent fashion of equating the so-called "welfare state" with Socialism, see Douglas Jerrold, *England: Past, Present, and Future*, Dent, p. 297. Mr. Jerrold, a distinguished Catholic and a member of the Conservative Party in Great Britain, insists rather indignantly that the "welfare state" owes its origin to the Conservative Party and that those who confuse it with Socialism are either ignorant or malicious. His opinion on this matter is probably a commonplace in England, but it may come as something of a surprise to many Americans.

¹³ Norman Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 159. See also in this connection: Henry Pratt Fairchild, *The Prodigal Century*, Philosophical Library, p. 210: "What has happened . . . is that varying degrees of coordinated administration have actually sprung up in the economic field but on the basis of private enterprise, and without the full participation of all members of society."

¹⁴ Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.*, n. 107.

ized around the principles of *Quadragesimo Anno* or, for better or for worse, it will be disciplined and ordered by the machinery of the State. This is the American dilemma, therefore, as of 1951: how to establish effective social controls over a predominantly private but already highly collectivized economy without becoming totalitarian in the process.

Jacques Maritain has formulated the terms of this inescapable dilemma as follows:

The point which needs emphasis is this. For democracies today the most urgent endeavor is to develop social justice and improve world economic management, and to defend themselves against totalitarian threats from the outside and totalitarian expansion in the world; but the pursuit of these objectives will inevitably involve the risk of having too many functions of social life controlled by the State from above, and we shall be inevitably bound to accept this risk, as long as our notion of the State has not been restated on true and genuine democratic foundations, and as long as the body politic has not renewed its own structures and consciousness, so that the people become more effectively equipped for the exercise of freedom, and the State may be made an actual instrument for the common good of all. Then only will that very topmost agency, which is made by modern civilization more and more necessary to the human person in his political, social, moral, even intellectual and scientific progress, cease to be at the same time a threat to the

freedoms of the human person as well as of intelligence and science. . . .¹⁵

Maritain is a realist, unlike the typical American conservative who is rightly afraid of too much government, but is unable or unwilling to face up to the central fact of modern economic life, namely, that big government, normally speaking, is the more or less direct and inevitable consequence of economic liberalism—the result, in other words, of what Maritain refers to in the same context as “the deficiencies of a society whose basic structures are not sufficiently up to the mark with regard to justice.”¹⁶ These “deficiencies,” he says, “are the first cause of the trouble. And thus any theoretical objections or particular claims, even justified in their own particular spheres, will inevitably be considered as but minor things in the face of the vital necessity—not only factual but moral—of meeting the long-neglected wants and rights of the human person in the deepest and largest strata of the human society.”¹⁷

CHECK STATIST DRIFT

It goes without saying that Maritain is not a defeatist. He does not say that statism is inevitable. He merely says that the possibility of drifting into statism is a necessary risk—to the extent that we fail to

¹⁵ Jacques Maritain, *Man and the State*, University of Chicago Press, pp. 18-19.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

remedy those "deficiencies," the principal one being the absence of autonomous organs of the social economy capable of assuming many of the responsibilities which now more or less inevitably devolve upon the "state machinery." He looks forward—and this brings us back, however circuitously, to *Quadragesimo Anno*—to a pluralist society in which "all forms of social and economic activity, even the largest and most comprehensive ones, would start from the bottom, I mean from the free initiative of and mutual tension between the particular groups . . . rising in tiers and institutionally recognized."

He continues:

Then a definitely personalist and pluralist pattern of social life would come into effect in which new societal types of private ownership and enterprise would develop. And the State would leave to the multifarious organs of the social body the autonomous initiative and management of all the activities which by nature pertain to them. Its only prerogative in this respect would be its genuine prerogative as topmost umpire and supervisor, regulating these spontaneous and autonomous activities from the superior political point of view of the common good.¹⁸

At the present time a large measure of initiative and management on the part of the "state machinery" is necessary and desirable, not only factually but morally, as Maritain puts it; but "in order both to maintain and make fruitful the movement for social

improvement supported by the State, and to bring the State back to its true nature," he says "it is necessary that many functions now exercised by the State should be distributed among the various autonomous organs of a pluralistically structured body politic—either after a period of State capitalism or of State socialism, or, as is to be hoped, in the very process of the present evolution. . . ."¹⁹

BLOCKS TO SOCIAL ORDER

Maritain's proposal—which is merely a paraphrase in more philosophical terminology of the middle pages of *Quadragesimo Anno*—is commonly referred to in the United States, for lack of a better word, as the Industry Council Program. It remains to be seen whether the ICP will be brought into being in the United States "in the very process of the present evolution"—a consummation devoutly to be wished—or only "after a period of State capitalism or of State socialism." Time alone will tell. Meanwhile, however, it will perhaps be appropriate to hazard a sample listing of the obstacles to be reckoned with, together with a few of the more encouraging signs of progress.

The principal obstacle, it could be argued tentatively, is a certain unwillingness on the part of all of us, whether so-called "progressives" or "conservatives," to say goodbye for-

¹⁸ *Idem.*, p. 23.

¹⁹ *Idem.*, p. 27.

ever to the underlying principles of the old economy. We have long since abandoned *laissez faire*, Dr. Girvetz' reservations to the contrary notwithstanding, but even so-called "liberal" economists—Keynesians, for example, as Norman Thomas very appropriately reminds us—are committed to the "possibility of an adequate control of our economy without bothering much with . . . a philosophy of co-operation."²⁰ The philosophy of free competition—modified, to be sure, by the impact of both fact and theory—is lodged in our emotional blood stream and breaks out into goose pimples, as it were, whenever we seriously face up to all the implications of the Industry Council Program. "But competition," Mr. Thomas continues, echoing *Quadragesimo Anno* almost verbatim, "can never be the dominant principle for the organization of an economy directed to the conquest of poverty. That requires the ethical and practical sovereignty of the principle of cooperation."²¹

According to Thomas, as you might expect, the principle of cooperation can be institutionalized only in the

form of public ownership. According to *Quadragesimo Anno*, on the other hand, it can best be institutionalized—allowing for a certain amount of public ownership, of course, when necessity demands it—in the form of the Industry Council Program. How many modern economists—left, right, or center—actually accept this central and all-important conclusion of the encyclical in all its implications? How many of them "feel it in their bones" that the Industry Council Program is a social and ethical imperative? We ask the question not to answer it definitely, but merely to suggest that, while *laissez faire*, as we have previously indicated, has gone with the wind of wars and depressions and has been hastened on its way to oblivion by the two encyclicals, we are still hoping somehow or other to have our cake and eat it too.²²

THE EASY WAY

A second obstacle—superficially different from the first, but a blood relative—is the natural tendency on the part of almost all of us, including many so-called conservatives, to fol-

²⁰ Norman Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

²¹ *Idem.*, p. 193.

²² Even Wilhelm Röpke, the distinguished German-Swiss economist, whose writings have been very hospitably received in American Catholic circles, gags at the mere mention of anything resembling the Industry Council Program and, in the opinion of the present writer, rather patronizingly insists on identifying *Quadragesimo Anno* with his own particular version of neo-classical economics. Röpke, in this respect, is a perfect example, if you will, of a man who admittedly rejects the philosophy of *laissez faire* but at the same time holds to the "possibility of an adequate control of our economy," as Norman Thomas remarks about Keynes, who is an economist of another color, "without bothering much with . . . a philosophy of cooperation."

low the path of least resistance and run to the government too soon for the solution of those economic problems which are the inevitable by-products of our present disorganized and "confused" collectivism. This is not to say—quite the contrary, as a matter of fact—that government intervention is either unnecessary or undesirable. It is merely to suggest, as Maritain has stated so incisively, that even "in the very process of the present evolution" it is necessary "that many functions now exercised by the State should be distributed among the various autonomous organs of a pluralistically structured body politic. . . ."

The same point is made even more specifically and more directly in the 1950 Labor Day Statement of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

The State is the supreme authority in the temporal order, and precisely for this reason, as Pius XI reminds us, it ought "to let subordinate groups handle matters and concerns of lesser importance which would otherwise dissipate its efforts greatly." This does not mean that the government should in any way shirk its great responsibilities in the field of social legislation, but it does mean that the government should consciously encourage unions and trade associations to cooperate with one another for the solution of as many of their own problems as possible. It also means that

even when legislation is necessary to promote the general economic and social welfare or to protect the legitimate interests of individuals or groups, the government should utilize the experience of these organizations instead of relying exclusively on independent technical experts for the content and administration of legislative programs.²³

"The dangerous international situation, which may continue evil and threatening during our whole generation," says the NCWC Labor Day Statement, "makes extensive governmental action inevitable. For that reason, it is all the more necessary for efficiency's sake, for the sake of justice, for freedom's sake and for the sake of the brotherhood of people, to establish full cooperation of government—international, Federal, State and local—with private organizations. Otherwise we may become ourselves totalitarian in opposing totalitarianism."²⁴

SIGNS OF PROGRESS

But if there are "obstacles" to the gradual, grass-roots development of the ICP in the United States, there are also certain encouraging signs of progress or potential progress. The very fact that we already have a large measure of "confused collectivism" is potentially a source of strength as well as a signal of danger. It is potentially a source of strength in that the constituent elements of an organized "so-

²³ *Labor Day Statement, 1950, Social Action Department, NCWC.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

cial order" are already present in the economy to a greater extent perhaps than we are generally accustomed to realize. The American mythology says that ours is a competitive and more or less unorganized economy, but the fact of the matter is that the American economic system is already highly organized. The *materia prima* of a "social order," as the term is understood in *Quadragesimo Anno*, is already partly in existence and is waiting uncertainly to be "informed," as it were, gradually and from within its own structure, by a principle of unity and social authority founded on the natural law—or more suddenly and from without by the heavy hand of statism.

As evidence of the degree to which we are already organized—sometimes for good purposes, sometimes for bad—we may refer in passing to a recent publication of the U. S. Department of Commerce, *National Trade Associations of the United States*, an enormous directory giving detailed information about approximately 4,000 trade, professional, civic, labor, religious and other organizations, the majority of which are national in scope. Indispensable as a convenient reference book for the busy executive, it also serves a very useful purpose, as we have indicated, for all those who are interested in the reconstruction of the social order along the lines of the ICP.

ORGANIZATION WELL ADVANCED

One of the more common objections to the Industry Council Program can be summarized as follows: the Industry Council Program presupposes that employers and workers are already highly organized into their own voluntary associations. But, while workers are partially organized at the present time, employers are unorganized and wish to remain unorganized. Therefore the Industry Council Program, however desirable in theory, is impractical as far as the United States is concerned, at least for the foreseeable future.

This objection fails to take into account the information contained in the new directory of the Department of Commerce. Actually, American businessmen are very highly organized, much more so, as a matter of fact, than workers. Economists have known this for a long time, but even they will probably be surprised at the sheer quantity of statistical evidence provided in the new directory.

Fifteen-hundred national trade associations and an additional 300 associations made up predominantly of businessmen are listed. We are told that the 1,500 trade associations have a paid staff of 16,000 persons and a gross membership of over 1,000,000 business firms. Including locals and branches, it is estimated by the editors of the directory that there are 12,000 trade associations and 4,000

Chambers of Commerce, to say nothing of 15,000 civic service groups, luncheon clubs and similar organizations of business and professional men and women.

These figures, it seems to us, are extremely encouraging. They indicate that Americans are really not as individualistic as they sometimes pretend to be. Most important of all, they indicate that the groundwork for the Industry Council plan is already fairly well established. Neither labor nor management is completely organized, of course, but both are certainly well enough organized to warrant our giving serious thought to the establishment of the Industry Council Program.

MUST REVISE OBJECTIVES

The organization of the unorganized, particularly of unorganized workers, ought to continue to have a high priority on the agenda of social reconstruction. At the same time, however, we can be reasonably optimistic about the progress already made in this direction. Also, we can begin to concentrate on the all-important problem of persuading our existing organizations of labor and management to cooperate with one another on behalf of the common good instead of being preoccupied almost exclusively with their separate and more selfish interests.

The reader will remember that the Bishops of the United States called attention to this problem in 1948 in their annual statement, "The Christian in Action." They clearly recognized that economic individualism, which is so often said to be characteristic of the United States, is more of a myth than a fact. American economic individualism, they implied, has been transformed into "group individualism"—if we may use a rather contradictory phrase.

"Today we have labor partly organized," the Bishops tell us, "but chiefly for its own interests. We have capital or management organized, possibly on a larger scale, but again for its own interests. What we urgently need, in the Christian view of the social order, is the free organization of capital and labor in permanent agencies of cooperation for the common good."²⁵

The new directory of the Department of Commerce, as we already indicated, generously supports the Bishops' conclusion that our national economy, American mythology to the contrary notwithstanding, is already very highly organized.

The evidence, we repeat, is overwhelming—634 pages of names and addresses of national organizations, including 1,500 national trade associations and 200 national unions. Ten years from now, perhaps, the

²⁵ *The Christian in Action*, a statement by the Administrative Board, NCWC, 1948.

Department of Commerce will be able to publish another directory indicating that some of these trade associations and some of these unions, while preserving their own autonomy and their separate identity, have come together in "permanent agencies of cooperation for the common good." Let us hope so. Let us hope and pray that more and more of our trade associations and unions will take to heart the words of Pope Pius XI in his encyclical, *On Reconstructing the Social Order*:

"And may these free organizations [trade associations and unions among others], now flourishing and rejoicing in their salutary fruits, set before themselves the task of preparing the way, in conformity with the mind of Christian social teaching, for those larger and more important guilds, Industries and Professions [Industry Councils], which We mentioned before, and make every possible effort to bring them to realization."²⁶

Like it or not (and surely, as Catholics, we ought to like it) the future calls insistently for what Maritain refers to as "new societal types of private ownership and enterprise"—"socialization" in the proper sense of the word. These new "societal types of private ownership and enterprise"—which will give "organic

and institutional forms to that law of the 'common use' on which Thomas Aquinas has laid particular stress"²⁷—will be developed voluntarily and cooperatively from within the system of private enterprise, properly organized into a democratic "social order," or they will be imposed more or less awkwardly, as a factual and ethical requirement of the times, by the machinery of the State. There does not seem to be a third alternative in practice, and certainly there is none in Christian social theory.

Whether or not the people of the United States will accept the first alternative in time to forestall the imposition of the second will depend in turn, as *Quadragesimo Anno* reminds us, on whether or not there is to be in our country "a renewal of the Christian spirit, from which so many immersed in economic life have, far and wide, unhappily fallen away . . ." and in the absence of which all our efforts at social reconstruction will "be wasted and our house builded not on a rock but on shifting sand."²⁸ But this is a subject of another article, more important by far than the present cursory observations on the more "institutional" aspects of the two great encyclicals, the anniversary of which is to be commemorated on the fifteenth day of this, the Month of Mary.

²⁶ Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.*, n. 87.

²⁷ Jacques Maritain, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

²⁸ Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.*, n. 127.

Plea From the Vatican

JOSEPH P. FITZPATRICK, S.J.

Fordham University

A sermon delivered at a special Mass offered in the Church of St. Francis Xavier, New York, N. Y., May 20, 1951.

WHEN God spoke to His people through the great prophets of the Old Testament, two messages thundered out of the heavens time after time.

The first message regarded God Himself. There was one God and all should honor him. This was man's obligation in religion.

The second regarded man's neighbor: God had placed the riches of the earth here for a man's neighbor as well as for the man himself. Woe, then, to the man who deprived his neighbor of the goods of the earth that were due to him! Woe to the man who took advantage of his neighbor because his neighbor needed food or drink or shelter!

This second message touched man's obligation in justice.

During all that long history the prophets never allowed the people of God to forget one thing, that God was most concerned about the way men used the material goods of this world. For the resources of this earth—the air we breathe, the spring of cooling water, the lake alive with fish, the pasture nourishing its patient flock—God had intended for all men. And

if the children of God were in some way deprived of the wealth that God had placed here for their needs, then someone would be judged and judged severely for it.

Our Lord Himself followed this pattern, condemning alike idolatry and injustice. When He described the last judgment, He emphasized that He would ask us not: "Were you chaste," or "Were you sober"; but rather: "When I was hungry, did you feed Me—when I was thirsty, did you give Me drink?" At the very roots of all morality, therefore, is the question: do we use the wealth of this world in such a way that all the children of God have access to the goods God placed here for their needs?

In recent years two other prophets have raised their voices in the name of God to speak against injustice. The first one was Pope Leo XIII who, sixty years ago this week, published his remarkable encyclical on *The Condition of the Working Classes*. The second is Pope Pius XI who, twenty years ago this week, on the fortieth anniversary of Leo's letter, published an equally famous letter of his own on the *Reconstruction of the*

Social Order. Both of these men were teachers of faith and morality, but both of them spoke about business, about credit and banking, about wages and production. In words as strong and threatening as those of Isaias they warned the men of our generations that business and work were basically a matter of morality and that God would judge us severely on our use of the wealth He has placed here for all men.

In a simple society this matter is very clear. The coconut tree is at your doorstep; the corn is growing in your own backyard; the fish are in a pond down the street. Then if your neighbor prevents you from reaching the goods that you need, you can point to him in indignation and say: there is the guilty man, there is the sinner.

In our terribly complicated modern world things are quite different. When you are separated from the grain that feeds you by plows and combines and grain elevators, by the selling of futures in Chicago or the setting of parity prices in Washington, by thousands of miles of railroad track and the super-market, everything becomes hopelessly confused in a maze of figures on a balance sheet. We lose sight of the meaning God intended for the world's goods and for business. The glass of water is so far removed from the man who thirsts and the cotton is so far removed from the child who is

naked that we tend to look on these goods not as wealth to serve the needs of men but as products to serve the profits of a business. And when the water fails to reach the man who thirsts or the cotton fails to clothe the naked child, the pitiful failure is judged in terms of money, not morality. Men do not say: "This is not right," but rather: "It does not pay."

OBLIGATION OF JUSTICE

It was to correct this terrible error that Pope Leo and Pope Pius sent their messages to the world. Business and work are basically a moral matter. They exist to serve men, not to enslave them. And whether you enslave men by the stroke of a whip on a Roman galley or enslave them by the stroke of a pen in a banking house, the crime is basically the same. Therefore, in a social order such as ours, where in the face of abundance men are still in need, the obligation of justice calls clearly to each of us.

The Popes beg us all in their letters to recognize our moral obligation to change this social order, so that the abundance of the world may be brought to satisfy the needs of all the people in the world.

They beg us to look on private property not as something to be abolished, but as something to be made really personal, by extending to every working man the chance to

possess some property of his own, or at least to enjoy the substitute security of a living wage.

They remind the employer in strikingly clear words that every workingman has a right to organize into labor unions, and they explained that a union is not a tyranny which destroys the freedom of employers; it is a form of group action to restore the freedom of employes, to enable working men to take their rightful place as first-class citizens of society.

They recall that government has every right to intervene in economic life, for government has the obligation to provide for the common welfare.

Finally, in words in which they seem almost to be weeping, they beg men to see that society should not be split into two opposing classes, should not be sundered by class war between those who sell their work for wages and those who buy it. Rather, since work is the use of human energy to put the goods of the world at the service of the men of the world, it should not be a thing that divides employer from employee; it should be the thing that unites them. Do they not together feed the hungry, whether they own the baking company or merely tend the ovens? Do they not together shelter the homeless, whether they furnish the tools and machines or merely pour the concrete? The realization that together they bring the goods of the world to

the service of their fellowmen should make employers and employes conscious of their great dignity, their unity, their common responsibility. It is only by this common effort of employer and employee, organized to subordinate business to the welfare of men, that we will be saved from the threatening slavery of Communism, or of some other form of the all-powerful state.

A NEW SPIRIT

Such, in brief, was the message of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI. That message is as full of meaning for us today as it was when it first thrilled the downtrodden miners in 1891, or reassured the anxious world in the depths of the 1931 depression. It is meant for each of us. Whether we give the orders from behind the desk or carry them out on the assembly line, whether we make a Cadillac in Detroit or drive it on Park Avenue, the message urges upon us a new heart and a new spirit, a spirit summarized in the key social virtues of charity, justice and poverty of spirit:

Charity that seeks God before all things else, not only in Himself but in every neighbor who rides the bus we drive, who reads the paper we print, who lives in the house we build.

Poverty that saves us from being slaves to riches, that leaves us free to give rather than receive, that makes us like to Christ in the calm detach-

ment from the wealth that might tempt us to envy and selfishness and deceit.

Justice that strives always to bring to all the children of God the goods that God placed here for their use. Only when these virtues have set straight the hearts of men will the

minds of men set straight the world of business.

In our commemoration today, therefore, it remains for us to thank God for the teachers He has given us and to beg Him for the grace to practice in our lives the things they taught.



Living Wage

In the first place, the worker must be paid a wage sufficient to support him and his family. That the rest of the family should also contribute to the common support, according to the capacity of each, is certainly right, as can be observed especially in the families of farmers, but also in the families of many craftsmen and small shopkeepers. But to abuse the years of childhood and the limited strength of women is grossly wrong. Mothers, concentrating on household duties, should work primarily in the home or in its immediate vicinity. It is an intolerable abuse, and to be abolished at all cost, for mothers on account of the father's low wage to be forced to engage in gainful occupations outside the home to the neglect of their proper cares and duties, especially the training of children. Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage large enough to meet ordinary family needs adequately. But if this cannot always be done under existing circumstances, social justice demands that changes be introduced as soon as possible whereby such a wage will be assured to every adult workingman. It will not be out of place here to render merited praise to all who, with a wise and useful purpose, have tried and tested various ways of adjusting the pay for work to family burdens in such a way that, as these increase, the former may be raised and indeed, if the contingency arises, there may be enough to meet extraordinary needs.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 52.



International Trade

In international trade relations let all means be sedulously employed for the removal of those artificial barriers to economic life which are the effects of distrust and hatred. All must remember that the peoples of the earth form but one family in God.—*On Atheistic Communism*, N. 76.

The Labor Encyclicals Today

FRIEDRICH BAERWALD

Fordham University

Reprinted from THOUGHT*

DURING May of this year celebrations were held in many parts of the world commemorating the twin anniversaries of the great social encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum* of 1891 and *Quadragesimo Anno* of 1931. While these public demonstrations are added proof that there is an ever-widening interest in Catholic social teachings,¹ it is well to bear in mind that much remains to be done to improve current methods of studying, interpreting and applying these principles. Let us also not overlook the fact that within the Catholic world itself there still linger attitudes of nonacceptance or purely verbal affirmation of the basic social teachings of the Popes. When *Rerum Novarum* was promulgated, there were some "Catholics who looked askance at the efforts of workers to form associations of this type as if they smacked of a socialistic or revolutionary spirit."² This sounds strangely

familiar at the present time when many people label "socialistic" every social program that runs counter to their particular interests.

Quadragesimo Anno also had some rough going among Catholics. Six years after its release, Pope Pius XI found occasion to raise the following question: "What is to be thought of the action of those Catholic employers who in one place succeeded in preventing the reading of our encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* in their local churches? Or of those Catholic industrialists who even to this day have shown themselves hostile to a labor movement that We Ourselves recommended?"³

There is no doubt that since *Quadragesimo Anno* was published, labor has made enormous strides in this country and management has paid ever-increasing attention to the problem of good industrial relations. But we still seem to be far from a full

¹ Indicative of this is the thorough, objective study by a non-Catholic, Prof. Melvin J. Williams, *Catholic Social Thought* (The Ronald Press, 1950). See also the excellent work by Fr. J. Cronin, *Catholic Social Principles* (Bruce Publishing Co., 1950).

² *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 30, ed. N.C.W.C.

³ Encyclical on Atheistic Communism, par. 50 (ed. Paulist Press).

* Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y., Summer, 1951.

understanding of the meaning of the encyclicals. Too often we get lost in discussions of intricate details and lose sight of the broader issues. In other parts of the Western world, conditions seem to be even less favorable as far as actual relations between labor and management are concerned. Unfortunately it is precisely in some countries often referred to as Catholic that significant groups of management still are engaged in some class warfare "from above." In recent years they have taken advantage of the generous economic aid given by this country to strengthen their own economic position without showing any concern about the extremely low standards of living of their workers. Thus we must note the paradoxical fact that, while labor-management relations have improved greatly in the United States, an unintentional by-product of the American foreign aid program has been to continue and even aggravate class divisions abroad. To remedy this situation it is necessary for certain private American organizations to exercise greater restraint in their statements dealing with labor problems in foreign countries.⁴ The building up of defense against Communism is too

often viewed only as a military and economic problem. Unless we also emphasize the implications of social justice taught in the encyclicals, we might be building on sand.

CHANGES IN MODERN SOCIETY

The anniversary provides a welcome occasion to review the current state of thinking and action revolving around the Papal doctrines on labor. From time to time such a reassessment is necessary. For this need derives from the nature of these Papal letters themselves. They contain fundamental teachings on the status, the duties and rights of labor and of desirable patterns of labor-management relations. In developing these doctrines the Popes frequently refer to particular social conditions and circumstances as they prevailed at the time of the promulgation of the encyclicals. It follows that the lasting significance of the doctrines on labor for later times can be realized only if the interpreters have a thorough understanding of their own contemporary social and economic setting and are able to analyze the difference between the ideologies and institutions characteristic of 1891 or 1931 and the specific problems of

⁴ A particularly annoying example of this attitude was given recently by the European Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Foreign Trade Council when they tried to intervene in the internal affairs of the German Federal Republic, threatening withdrawal of foreign capital in the event of the adoption of the Co-determination Law giving labor some representation on the boards of corporations in the heavy industries. Of course the law was adopted.

the middle of the twentieth century. We will therefore outline some of the changes in modern society which took place since *Rerum Novarum* was issued. This will facilitate the understanding of the specific relevance of the Papal social teachings in our day and age.

TRADE-UNION MOVEMENT

Rerum Novarum produced immediate important results here and in Europe. It made clear that no legitimate objections could be raised against the participation of Catholics in the trade-union movement of this country—where the American Federation of Labor was gaining strength after the eclipse of the Knights of Labor. In Europe it inspired the founding of Christian trade unions because the already existing labor organizations were strongly Marxist and did, therefore, fail to measure up to those fundamental requirements of sound unionism that had been explained so carefully in the encyclical. But apart from these effects in the field of labor organization, this great document of Leo XIII was largely neglected in this country, at least during the first decade of its existence.⁵ The reasons for this early lack of interest and the later ascendancy

of the importance of Catholic social doctrines in public awareness are highly significant, and it is necessary to examine this development in some detail in order to gain full understanding of the present situation.

In the sixty years since *Rerum Novarum* our Western world has gone through many revolutionary changes, progressing at an ever accelerating pace. At the beginning of this period we were still living in an age of illusion. This was followed by the interval of the age of depression. Now the age of a long struggle for the safeguarding and revival of all our basic beliefs and institutions is at hand.

As the total situation becomes ever more critical, an increasing number of people who feel less and less secure turn their attention to the social teachings of the Church. The liberal who has lost his bearings, the capitalist in his never-ending search for "bulwarks against Bolshevism" have belatedly discovered the labor encyclicals.⁶ This rising general interest in Papal pronouncements certainly deserves to be welcomed. But at the same time we must beware of a certain bandwagon psychology and the danger it represents for the correct exposition and development of Catho-

⁵ See the detailed study by A. Abell, "The Reception of Leo XIII's Labor Encyclical in America, 1891-1919," *Review of Politics*, October, 1945.

⁶ See Josef Solterer, "Quadragesimo Anno, Schumpeter's Alternative to the Omnipotent State," *Review of Social Economy*, March, 1951.

lic social principles, which cannot be divorced from the more fundamental propositions of Christian philosophy. Hence we must resist certain attempts to interpret the labor encyclicals in a manner which would fit them into the framework of economic liberalism, extreme capitalism or exaggerated statism.

SCIENCE AND PROGRESS

In 1891 the age of illusion was still in full bloom. The prevailing mood of society was a boundless optimistic belief in Science, Technology and Progress. Everything associated in the minds of the moderns with the "Middle Ages" was looked upon at best with condescension; it did not command widespread attention or literary analysis and discussion. The intellectual and social climate of that age was not favorable to Papal social teachings. *Rerum Novarum* was issued at the high-water mark of social evolutionism and a general feeling of cultural achievement and self-congratulation. Capitalism, despite intermittent panics, was firmly established. It seemed to be growing stronger, thereby refuting the dire forecasts of collapse voiced by Marx and Engels. On the other hand Socialism, which for all practical purposes in those days was merely anti-capitalism, grew stronger among the working classes of Europe. The strength of this movement was nourished by the still unrelieved

misery of the majority of wage-earners. Working hours were long, wage rates low; there were many abuses in the employment of women and children; little protection against industrial hazards existed; economic security for wage and salary earners was unheard of. Depending on the social status of the individual, the solution to these ills was said to be found either in greater doses of capitalism or of Socialism.

But capitalists and Socialists alike agreed on the paramount importance of inexorable economic forces, the former hoping that they would work out to perpetuate the existing system by the mechanism of the market, the latter looking forward to its inevitable transformation into Socialism. Conforming to the prevailing thought patterns of evolutionism and materialism, these attitudes and expectations centered entirely around blind impersonal social forces. The non-economic, human problems created by modern industrialism were understood neither by capitalists nor by Socialists. But the message of Leo XIII is based precisely on this fundamental level of the problems of human dignity in modern industry. All his specific statements refer back to the existential aspects of living in an industrial setting.

Rerum Novarum rejects the mechanistic concept of an inevitable class struggle; it does not recognize the "laws of the labor market" as the

guardians of a just wage; it stresses the need to overcome the helplessness of the individual industrial worker through the mutual aid provided by labor unions; it outlines in some detail the duty of the State to intervene for the betterment of working conditions and the protection of the rights of wage-earners.⁷

In the sixty years since the release of *Rerum Novarum* the rate of technological advance has been accelerated beyond anything that seemed conceivable at the end of the last century. But people have lost the naive faith that better means of production can in themselves bring about a better society and a more meaningful human existence. The great pride in technical and scientific achievements is accompanied today by apprehensions about their ominous military and political implications.

SHATTERED ILLUSIONS

When *Quadragesimo Anno* was written, many illusions about capitalism had already been shattered in the cataclysm of the great depression. The experience of mass unemployment had completely changed the outlook of millions of people. Socialism too was viewed far more soberly and critically by its own adherents—especially in countries where Socialists had participated in

government and had influenced both legislation and administration after World War I. The fundamental economic problems seemed to be further from solution in spite of the remarkable improvement in the standards of living. But this disenchantment with a once proud secularist industrial society made people more receptive to *Quadragesimo Anno* than the preceding generation had been to the first labor encyclical. Nevertheless the twenty years separating us today from *Quadragesimo Anno* seem to be a longer period in terms of our collective experiences than the forty years that had elapsed between the first and the second Papal letters on labor conditions and the social order.

There is a fundamental difference between the age of depression and our age of struggle. Twenty years ago it was still possible to assume that the emergency was temporary in character. Today we have fully realized that ours is a continuing crisis which is not subject to quick and easy solutions, whether military or social. Those problems of the economic instability of business and the insecurity of labor which occupied the foreground of thinking twenty years ago have been solved in our era of war and defense economies. But all this occurred at the cost of

⁷ See *Rerum Novarum*, par. 15, 34, 36, 23, quoted from the text appended to *The Christian Social Manifesto*, by Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D. (Bruce Publishing Co., 1931).

creating a far greater degree of purely political insecurity and tension.

Thus the problem of labor has ceased for the time being to be predominantly economic. It has blended into the larger aspects of the situation of individuals and free associations in the total crisis of modern society. Those domestic differences between capital and labor which were one of the main topics of the two Papal letters have been superseded by the necessity of preserving cooperation in a unified front fighting against Communism. But this tendency of modern society toward single-mindedness carries with it dangers for the future of labor relations. For the manufacturers of urgently needed defense equipment it offers a great temptation to retrace the steps of recent social gains and to enhance their economic and political position under the banner of the enduring emergency. For this reason it is necessary to review this new situation in the light of the fundamental teachings of the encyclicals.

In our age of struggle all the most powerful and efficient devices of modern industry are geared to the defense of social institutions and values. Economic activities and social relations have become involved in these efforts to overcome and to resolve the recurrent deadly threats of nihilistic totalitarianism. This basic situation must be borne in mind in any attempt to relate the meaning of

the encyclicals, especially their concept of social justice, to the present time.

SOCIALISM AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

One of the central topics of *Rerum Novarum* and of *Quadragesimo Anno* is the problem of private property. Another is the status of the workers as persons and as members of associations in the bewildering world of industrialism. In 1891 private ownership of means of production was under sharp attack by Socialists. They proposed its transfer into social ownership by means of expropriation without compensation. On the other side, property-owners did not confine themselves to rejecting these unjust claims; they opposed trade unions and in many cases refused to have any dealings with organized labor. The encyclicals upheld acquired property rights. But they also stressed that these rights are not absolute and that to some extent they must suffer the restraints implied in the duty, first of all, of recognizing and bargaining with labor unions and, secondly, of complying with those economic and social policies of government that had been designed to improve the social conditions of the lower-income groups.

It is deeply significant that in our era private property and free labor unions have been abolished simultaneously in the Communist orbit. In the Western world the institution of

private property as such has been preserved. Wherever nationalization occurred, it certainly was not carried out without adequate compensation. As the labor movement grew stronger, the opposition to private ownership of the means of production became less vocal and the emphasis in the demands of labor shifted to improvements in conditions of pay and employment.

But since 1891 the substance of private property itself has undergone fundamental changes. Ownership of the means of production, while remaining private, largely ceased to be individual and became corporate. Purely monetary assets of individuals were reduced by the almost continuous inflationary pressure of this age of struggle. The overwhelming majority of people derive their income from employment and not from the yields of their own property. Furthermore, private ownership of means of production has been subject to large-scale concentration. This has increased the significance of expert managerial services for its most efficient employment. Thus the whole complex of private property today has taken up a new location in the social structure. Its relation to individuals has become somewhat remote and tenuous. It functions largely through incorporated organizations. In this form it is no longer facing individual isolated workers but another organization—the trade

union. Thus labor relations have in fact become relations between the spokesmen of powerful organizations. This has introduced into industrial relations all those concomitant factors of prestige, institutional self-preservation and rivalries which tend to increase rigidity and social tensions.

NEW DANGERS

These developments have brought about new dangers for social justice and stability. They are being aggravated in our age of war and defense economies. The strength of these great groupings of labor and management has become so great that they have been able to shift a large part of the burden of the cost of preparedness on the shoulders of the small business units and of the unorganized. This is being brought about by wage and profit policies leading to increased inflationary pressures, by disregard for the need of those sectors of the economy not immediately involved in the defense effort and by a general ascendancy of producers and sellers over mere consumers and buyers.

Thus, in the era of a permanent defense economy the problem of social justice appears in a new setting. How can this virtue be exercised when issues are settled in the name not of individuals but of organizations of property and of labor? Under such conditions spokesmen and

negotiators may not be greedy as individuals, but they operate under a particularly complex set of motivations because they are not free agents acting for themselves; they are accountable to their organizations operating on impersonal principles of institutional advantage. This pattern of economic relationship between large economic entities centered around particular areas of the production of goods and services has an inherent tendency to leave out of sight the larger economic picture and to make special deals at the expense of those outside the negotiating organizations. It may very well be that in such cases just labor conditions may be established in certain sectors of the economy, especially those of primary importance for defense, but only at the expense of deteriorating trends elsewhere.

INDUSTRY COUNCILS

From the very beginning the Papal teachings on labor have stressed a comprehensive view of social justice and the need to relate particular applications to the community as a whole.⁸ This has given rise to the idea that a system of "industry councils" might be devised to decide all economic problems of mutual interest arising in an industry through a chain

of interlocking local, regional and national bodies.⁹ Very often this scheme is presented as an application of the principle of subsidiarity, which states that higher social units, especially government, should not carry out functions which can readily and efficiently be performed by more immediate groupings such as the family, the individual firm, or a combination of businesses operating in the same field.

Before we examine in some detail the question to what extent *Quadragesimo Anno* can be said to contain a mandate to work toward the establishment of such a system, it is necessary to stress that in our age of struggle the conditions under which the principle of subsidiarity is to be applied have changed radically. The prospects of its practical application on a large scale have been reduced by the growth of the defense economy and its long-range impact on our modern economic system (which cannot be cancelled arbitrarily even in the case of a future relaxation of international tension). Levels of output, prices, profits and wages throughout the economy are determined by the very size of government expenditures for military equipment, for foreign aid and payments for past wars. These tremendous

⁸ *Rerum Novarum*, par. 27; *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 88.

⁹ The Industry Council Plan Committee of the American Catholic Sociological Society has been very busy in working out detailed blueprints for the organization of such councils.

pressures make it more urgent than ever to provide new instrumentalities for the assertion of principles of social justice and the restraint of the strong egotism of special economic interests which are trying to take advantage of the opportunities created by the defense economy. But the urgent problem of giving institutional expression to the need for a higher principle of economic order cannot be brought closer to solution by insisting on industry councils to which government should transfer major economic responsibilities and thereafter withdraw from the field of price, credit and wage policies.

This does not mean that the social encyclicals are suspended for the duration. On the contrary it requires an intensive study of the best ways to build institutions dedicated to the promotion of the common good into the structure of the defense economy without committing them to the handling of problems beyond their reach. It is, therefore, advisable to put into the proper perspective the discussion of the "special system of syndicates,"¹⁰ the re-establishment of "industries and professions"¹¹ and the creation of a "juridical and social order which will as it were give form and shape to all economic life"¹² that we find in *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Sufficient attention has not been

paid in recent discussions to the fact that while *Rerum Novarum* deplores to a certain extent the disappearance of the ancient guilds, it does not develop suggestions for new syndicates. Why was an "industry council plan" not mentioned in *Rerum Novarum* whereas such schemes are given so much attention in *Quadragesimo Anno*? A further inquiry may throw more light on this problem.

MUSSOLINI AND LABOR

Let us recall the historical context of the second labor encyclical. In 1927 Mussolini had with great fanfare introduced his *Carta di Lavoro*. The Italian Department of Labor was changed into a "Ministry of Corporations." Syndicates comprising management and labor were set up. They completely abolished self-organizations of labor. It is easy to see why the Holy Father found it necessary to comment on this new type of industrial organization. The encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* afforded the occasion. While Pius XI discussed certain advantages in this system, he added a fundamental critique, stating that the corporate system of the fascist type substituted government for free activity and that "the new syndical and corporate order savors too much of an involved and political system of administration," and that

¹⁰ *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 91 to 94.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, par. 82.

¹² *Ibid.*, par. 88.

"it rather serves particular political ends than leads to the reconstruction and promotion of a better social order."¹³

It should be stressed that this was rather strong language in view of the fact that it was spoken at the very height of Mussolini's power and only shortly after the conclusion of the Lateran Treaty. Today, twenty years later, the corporate state, which largely remained a paper organization even in Italy, is a thing of the past. The collapse of the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini was followed by the immediate and effective re-establishment of free trade unions. Next to purely religious organizations, they were the only groups able to reconstitute themselves without any delay. For this reason the discussion of the role of unions and of the requirements they must fulfill in order to make participation by Catholics possible has to go back to *Rerum Novarum*, because the fundamental problem of unionism today is closer to the situation of 1891 than to the peculiar and temporary circumstances of the fascist era. This is also borne out by the growing strength of Christian trade unions in Western Europe which, especially in France, have been able to increase membership and influence far above the prewar level.

The return to free self-organizations of labor in Europe does not,

however, indicate the end of efforts, based on Papal social teachings, to bring about a more organic structure of cooperation among various groupings of employers and employees and to integrate them into a social and economic order. In his address of May, 1949, to the International Union of Catholic Employers Associations, Pope Pius XII said: "Why should it not be lawful to give workers a fair share of responsibility in the establishment and development of national economy. . . ?" This, according to the Holy Father, could be brought about by "a statute of public law for social economy based precisely on the mutual responsibility of all those sharing the work of production."

As the present Holy Father explains, authoritatively, this participation of workers in the shaping of over-all targets in the economic activities of the nation is the real purpose of the professional organizations mentioned in *Quadragesimo Anno* (and not to be confused with the "syndicates" referred to critically in the same document).

DELIBERATIVE BODIES

The great significance of officially established deliberative bodies of top-level, regional and local representatives for organizations of management and of labor in our era of a

¹³*Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 95.

permanent defense economy should be apparent to everyone. Removed from partisan politics they would provide an atmosphere for discussing the grave issues of a just distribution of the burdens of the defense economy, for voicing grievances and for adjusting conflicts about broad policies. These bodies would not be burdened with the settlement of detailed questions arising in the daily operation of plants and industry; they would, however, serve in an advisory capacity to the various agencies concerned with the administration of the defense economy. The real influence of these groupings would depend on their actual performance and the hold on public opinion they could gain by the level of their public deliberations and hearings.

It is clear from *Quadragesimo Anno* and the above-mentioned statement of Pope Pius XII that these organizations should be created by statute and that once established they would be an important part of the "social and economic order." The repeated emphasis on public law in connection with the setting up of professional groupings has created certain difficulties of interpretation in this country. This emphasis is rooted in a condition which needs further exploration by Catholic scholars of this country. Quite naturally the Papal pronouncements use the standard legal terminology of the

continental European tradition, which goes back to Roman law. Hence such terms as "private and public rights" which permit of no misunderstanding within the context of European legal concepts must be carefully transposed into the different system of Anglo-Saxon law. The difficulties are connected with the fact that in Europe the distinction between constitutional and administrative law has long been worked out in detail, whereas in this country this is a comparatively new and somewhat strange problem.

But these legalistic and to a certain extent semantic difficulties are no reason why close approximations to the Papal program of professional and industrial groupings should not be attempted in this country. In fact, the various advisory boards set up in our present defense economy could be considered a significant step in the right direction. They are weak, however, as far as representation of consumers is concerned. Furthermore, they seem to leave out those not immediately concerned with defense production. At present these boards are emergency improvisations. They could become the nucleus for a more lasting structure of an organic economic order envisioned by Catholic social doctrines.

However, it is well to remember that the encyclicals contain far more than outlines for industrial cooperation. There is a certain danger of

concentrating too much on purely organizational aspects in our interpretation of these documents. This is indicative of a trend, only too widespread today, toward placing undue reliance on organizations and procedures and assuming that problems can be solved in a formalistic manner. Actually the encyclicals have far more to say on the situation of mankind under the stress and strains of industrialism and the obstacles created by a mass-production civilization against the projection of an authentic personal existence. As techniques of labor-management relations are being improved and as material standards of living are being raised, it is necessary to devote more thought to those passages in the encyclicals which deal with these human implications of the modern economy. Much work has to be done along these lines by Catholic scholarship through the threefold approaches of ethics, sociology and psychology.

The opening passages of *Rerum Novarum* show that the primary concern of Leo XIII was the problem of the Christian existence of people involved in the modern industrial situation. He speaks of the social void into which they were thrown as they left secure, well-defined rural environments to become industrial workers. This transition is described by Pope Leo XIII as follows: "It has

come to pass that workingmen have been surrendered, isolated and helpless, to the hardheartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition."¹⁴ This theme is carried further in an impressive manner in *Quadragesimo Anno*. Pope Pius XI states: "Free competition has destroyed itself; economic dictatorship has supplanted the free market; unbridled ambition for power has likewise succeeded greed for gain; all economic life has become tragically hard, inexorable and cruel."¹⁵

COLLECTIVE INDIVIDUALISM

Now these tragic aspects of modern economic life are not to be found in poverty, exploitation and the lack of economic opportunity. On the contrary they become more apparent as levels of material civilization improve. As Pius XI pointed out twenty years ago, the profit motive has largely been superseded by aspirations and considerations of power. In this world of large economic organizations, sometimes cooperating with each other but more often engaged in competitive and antagonistic struggle, the "individualism" which is so fondly remembered in the publicity releases of big business has changed just as much as has the old simple monetary profit motive.

Today we are confronted with the manifestations of collective indi-

¹⁴ *Rerum Novarum*, par. 2.

¹⁵ *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 109.

vidualism, the egotism of organizations of business and of labor, the disappearance from the public scene, with few exceptions, of genuinely personal utterances by leaders of government, and their replacement by synthetic products of teams of public-opinion-conscious copywriters. In this setting the individual can overcome his isolation only through affiliation with these large economic groupings. Because they have become the only way in which he can locate himself in modern industrial society, he is prone to project his loyalty to these organizations and to become emotionally involved in their conflicts and controversies. This in turn enhances the possibilities for institutional aggrandizements and the possibility of leaders of organizations indulging in their particular type of individualism.

The over-all result of these developments is the growth of social tension. But unlike the tense situation of the class struggle of the Marxist type, this tension is generated by the operation of pressures caused by the impact of living in a world of large impersonal organizations. While this is apt to lead to the spread of aggressive behavior, the greater danger in the long run seems to be growing mass apathy, cynicism, spiritual indifferentism and general escapism.

This danger of the rise of a social world devoid of meaning and concerned exclusively with the techniques

of operation can be overcome only by an elaboration of the total meanings of the encyclicals. It cannot be denied that Marx saw far more clearly than did the classical economists of his day the social implications of economic activity. He did not try to isolate economics from its social context, as the liberals of his and our own time are doing. But his dialectic materialism and economic determinism led him and his followers completely astray in their attempt to understand historical situations and the complexities of individual behavior in the machine age. The ultimate disastrous effects of these errors can be seen today in the sterile terror of the dehumanized Soviet state.

By contrast, the main emphasis of the encyclicals is on economic relations as human relations. The problem of our age is to make a breakthrough to this level and to work out ways in which the contemporary need for large-scale organization can be reconciled with the urge of people to maintain their sense of identity and function in a system largely characterized by impersonal operations and institutional interests. Sixty years after *Rerum Novarum* there are still new things and they must be the concern of all those who believe that only the fullness of Catholic action can extricate the world from the hopeless alternatives of materialistic capitalism and atheistic Communism.

The Popes and the Industrial Revolution

BENJAMIN L. MASSE, S.J.

*Reprinted from AMERICA**

THE sixtieth anniversary of Pope Leo's encyclical, *The Condition of the Working Classes*, and the twentieth anniversary of Pope Pius XI's, *The Reconstruction of the Social Order*, are events transcending Catholic interests. Referring to the former, Philip Taft, non-Catholic chairman of the Department of Economics of Brown University, wrote in these pages about a year ago: "Although the encyclical is almost sixty years old, it reads today like a current document" (AM. 4/22/50). Mr. Taft suggested that non-Catholics as well as Catholics could find valuable guidance in both statements of Catholic social teaching.

To this internationally famous scholar, these writings had a "vitality and freshness absent in many contemporary documents." They not only exposed the economic maladies of our times, he wrote, "but the remedies prescribed have been found effective in the past and are sufficiently potent to be helpful in the present."

We ought to seize upon the occasion of this double anniversary to deepen our understanding of the Papal teaching embodied in these classic expressions, and to strengthen our

determination to spread a knowledge of them among our contemporaries. It is not at all surprising that a knowledgeable non-Catholic economist should find contemporary value in these two somewhat aged documents. Though the world has changed enormously since Leo and Pius wrote, the basic problem they dealt with—how to subject modern industrial society to the reign of social justice and charity—remains essentially the same.

In Leo's time there was widespread dissatisfaction among the wage-earning class. There is widespread dissatisfaction today. In Leo's time the workers, having lost control of their tools, were losing the sense of ownership. Today the tools workers use are still largely owned by others, and the feeling for ownership and responsibility has all but died. In the 1890's the urban masses desperately sought a security which escaped them. Today, in spite of far-reaching social-welfare legislation, a sense of insecurity troubles workers everywhere. Sixty years ago workers fought employers for a just distribution of industrial income. They are struggling for the same objective today. And in

*70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y., May 12, 1951

1891 there were men who went so far as to say that peace and justice would never reign in industrial society until all social classes had been eliminated and the means of production were publicly owned. Their Socialist successors are saying the same thing today.

Looking back over the past six decades an observer might note here and there a vast improvement in the worker's status and standard of living. Certainly English and American, Belgian, Swiss and Swedish, Canadian and Australian workers are better off today than were their grandfathers. Almost every industrial nation has applied reformist legislation to the worst sores on the body social and economic. But in view of contemporary unrest, in view especially of the world-wide challenge of Communism, he would be an optimistic observer, indeed, who would conclude that the sources of infection have been dried up and the social body restored to health. Only blind men do not see today that the world of our time is in the full-tide of revolution, and that the form and direction it should take have not yet been defined.

Rerum Novarum and *Quadragesimo Anno* do not live because they supply easy and detailed answers to all the complex and maddening problems of the modern world. They live because they restate the well-grounded Christian principles from which the detailed answers must be derived.

They live because they measure the social problem in terms of man, properly understood—not the “proletarian man” of Karl Marx, not the “economic man” of the classical economists, but the real man of human history, the man made by God and redeemed by Jesus Christ. They live because they furnish a criterion by which can be judged both the evils of the present order and the remedies advanced to meet them—if not with absolute assurance, at least with such prudential assurance as is possible here below.

The evils described by Leo and Pius were grievous and manifold. They all derived, in one way or another, from that exaggerated individualism, or false liberalism, which, itself the product of the modern apostasy from God, is in one way or another the source of most modern errors.

MISERY OF THEIR TIMES

In economics the manifestation of individualism was the theory known historically as *laissez-faire*. Based on the paradox that private vices could be public virtues, this theory saw in the free and unrestricted pursuit of self-interest (the profit motive) the key to material progress. Its proponents argued that the *competition* resulting from the uninhibited rush of a variety of individuals to increase their fortunes would be a sufficient check on avarice and would constitute the

only kind of regulation—"natural" self-regulation—which economic activity required. The State had only to keep order, like a policeman, and prevent any combining of individuals that might interfere with the free operation of the law of supply and demand. Such a system, or lack of system, would reward the energetic and enterprising, and punish the slothful and improvident. It would inevitably result in national and international prosperity.

By the time Leo XIII wrote, economic individualism had dominated the thinking and practice of the business world for a little more than a century. Its achievement was visible in an enormous increase of wealth. Equally visible, however, was the terrible price in human suffering and social and political instability which this "progress" exacted. In a graphic paragraph, Pope Leo summarized the first hundred years of laissez-faire:

After the old trade guilds had been destroyed in the last century, and no protection was substituted in their place, and when public institutions and legislation had cast off traditional religious teaching, it gradually came about that the present age handed over the workers, each alone and defenseless, to the inhumanity of employers and the unbridled greed of competitors. A devouring usury, although often condemned by the Church, but practised nevertheless under another form by avaricious and grasping men, has increased the evil; and in addition the whole process of production as well as trade in every kind of goods has been brought almost

entirely under the power of a few, so that a very few rich, and exceedingly rich, men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the unnumbered masses of non-owning workers.

The "yoke almost of slavery" included child labor, the exploitation of women, inadequate wages, intolerably long hours of work, unsanitary factories and dangerous conditions of work, lack of job tenure and a general insecurity which pervaded the whole life of the working class. "Bodily labor," wrote Pius XI forty years later, "which Divine Providence decreed to be performed, even after original sin, is being everywhere changed into an instrument of perversion: for dead matter comes forth from the factory ennobled, while men are corrupted and degraded."

SOME PROGRESS

In the tragic years which elapsed between *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*—years which saw the first World War, the Communist capture of Russia and the beginning of the great 1929 depression—there was marked improvement in the living conditions of the non-owning working class. This was almost wholly due to the intervention of governments. By the beginning of the 1930's, practically every industrialized country had factory-inspection laws, workmen's compensation, restrictions on the working hours of women and children, minimum-wage laws, unemployment insurance and other types of

protection against the unpredictable hazards of life. Though Pius XI gladly acknowledged this progress, he nevertheless wrote in 1931:

The ultimate consequences of the individualist spirit in economic life are those which you yourselves, Venerable Brethren and Beloved Children, see and deplore: free competition has destroyed itself; economic dictatorship has supplanted the free market; unbridled ambition for power has likewise succeeded greed for gain; all economic life has become tragically hard, inexorable and cruel.

Like the 19th-century Socialist reformers, the Popes sought to eliminate the abuses of individualism by stressing the social nature of man, of work and property, and of the entire economic process. But unlike the Socialists they did not swing to the other extreme of denying the legitimate claims of the individual.

Specifically, Pope Leo said bluntly that the Socialist concept of human equality was false in theory and unattainable in practice.

In answer to the demand that private ownership of the means of production be abolished, under the hypothesis that only in this way could the exploitation of man by man be ended, he reiterated the traditional teaching of the Church that ownership is a natural right, one, namely, inherent in human nature as it came from the hands of God and, therefore, antecedent to the State. It was the abuse of private ownership, not ownership itself, he insisted, which led

to the exploitation of workers and begot the spirit of class hatred and warfare. Nature itself dictated between owners and workers a relation of partnership, since neither could survive without the other. This relationship the Christian religion, with its emphasis on human brotherhood, reinforced.

Finally, Socialism erred in depriving men of legitimate incentives, in misconceiving the true nature of the State, and in its false concept of the human individual, of the family and of society as a whole. Should Socialism triumph, He warned, the workers would be worse off than before.

Though great changes occurred in Socialism during the four decades between *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, and a so-called "mitigated" or "right-wing" Socialism began to advocate reforms not too dissimilar from the Church's own program, Pius XI refused to lift the ban which Leo had imposed on all Catholics. So long as Socialism remained truly Socialism, the Pope taught, even though it abandoned its doctrines of class warfare and State ownership, it could not be reconciled with the teachings of the Church. He gave as the reason "its concept of society," which remains "utterly foreign to Christian truth."

This seeming intransigence distressed many well-intentioned Catholics and Socialists who saw in a united front between Christian Democ-

racy and "Democratic Socialism" the only hope of turning aside the twin threats of Fascism and Communism. It continues to distress some people, even though fairly recent developments in France, Belgium and Italy show how difficult it is to preserve such an alliance, even on an exclusively political and economic plane. Until Socialists abandon their traditional secularism, until they cease, that is, ignoring God in public life and dealing with man and his problems on a purely naturalistic level, there can be no compromise that permits more than a limited kind of co-operation.

The reason why this is so leads naturally to a consideration of the positive program which the Popes sketched as an alternative to both economic individualism and Socialism.

MORALITY AND ECONOMICS

Fundamental to the Papal approach is the doctrine that economics and political science, though legitimate disciplines, cannot be divorced from religion and morality. Pius XI gives the reason in the following passage:

Even though economics and moral science employs each its own principles in its own sphere, it is nevertheless an error to say that the economic and moral orders are so distinct from and alien to each other that the former depends in no way on the latter. Certainly, the laws of economics, as they are termed, being based on the very nature of material things and on the capacities of the human body and mind, determine

the limits of what productive human effort cannot, and of what it can, attain in the economic field and by what means. Yet it is reason itself that clearly shows, on the basis of the individual and social nature of things and of men, the purpose which God ordained for all economic life.

What does reason show, then, about man, about his economic activities and about the political and social framework in which they are to be carried on?

1. Reason shows that men are children of God, and that, as a consequence, they can never be subordinated to economic techniques and goals—to the machine and the profit motive.

2. Reason shows that God destined the resources of the world for the support of the whole human race.

3. Reason shows that private ownership is normally the best means—and the one most appropriate to human dignity—for developing natural resources and making them serve the end appointed by God. Neither the possession of private property, however, nor the use of it, is absolute. Though property is privately held, it must always serve social ends. To make sure that it does so is ultimately the duty of the State, the supreme authority in the temporal order. As Pius XI taught:

When the State brings private ownership into harmony with the needs of the common good, it does not commit a hostile act against private owners but rather does them a friendly service . . .

it does not weaken property rights, but strengthens them.

Thus factory-inspection laws, restrictions on child labor and minimum-wage laws are a legitimate exercise of public authority.

4. Reason shows that all normal adult working men have a moral claim, in exchange for an honest day's work, to a family living wage. If this wage is not large enough to afford protection against accident, sickness and old age the lack should be supplied by some form of social insurance. Ideally, the best form of security is ownership, and workers should be enabled and encouraged to save, with a view to acquiring property. Since wages, like property, have a social aspect, they should be measured not merely by individual needs but also by the needs of the commonweal.

5. Reason shows that the association of individuals engaged in the same economic function is natural. Wherefore, men have a moral right to establish trade unions and employer organizations by virtue of the natural law. Such associations have the negative function of defending their interests against attack. They also have the positive function of promoting the well-being of their trade or industry, and of collaborating with other groups to promote the general welfare.

6. Reason shows that the right to strike is likewise a natural right, but

one that can be legitimately exercised only as a last resort, and peaceably.

7. Reason shows that the State is much more than a policeman. It has the positive role of promoting the common good. In discharging this role, it does not aim at supplanting private initiative, but rather at stimulating it and providing a framework within which groups and individuals can function for the well-being of all.

8. Reason shows, finally, that society should not be conceived as a collection of atomized individuals, with the State at the top, but rather as an organic structure in which individuals find their place through membership in a variety of self-governing socio-economic groups. The former concept, which grew out of individualist philosophy, results in overburdening the State. As the State supplies the deficiencies of unrestricted "self-enlightened" endeavor, it tends to expand beyond all reason and threaten personal freedom, initiative and security. The final phase of this development is the Totalitarian State.

On the other hand, if individuals develop their social instincts and exercise their right of free association, occupational groups spontaneously arise in all sectors of the economy, and these groups, given juridical status, exercise a degree of self-government which frees the State from a host of burdensome details. In this way the State is enabled to exercise its high function of encouraging, guid-

ing and controlling economic activity in the light of the common good.

Such a society, essentially democratic, offers a middle way between anarchic individualism and suffocating centralism. It reconciles liber-

ty and authority, the rights of the individual and the demands of the common good. It offers the best hope today, perhaps the only hope, of checking the steady drift toward some form of the Omnipotent State.



Public Welfare

It is not right, as We have said, for either the citizen or the family to be absorbed by the State; it is proper that the individual and the family should be permitted to retain their freedom of action, so far as this is possible without jeopardizing the common good and without injuring anyone. Nevertheless, those who govern must see to it that they protect the community and its constituent parts: the *community*, because nature has entrusted its safeguarding to the sovereign power in the State to such an extent that the protection of the public welfare is not only the supreme law, but is the entire cause and reason for sovereignty; and the *constituent parts*, because philosophy and Christian faith agree that the administration of the State has from nature as its purpose, not the benefit of those to whom it has been entrusted, but the benefit of those who have been entrusted to it. And since the power of governing comes from God and is a participation, as it were, in His supreme sovereignty, it ought to be administered according to the example of the Divine power, which looks with paternal care to the welfare of individual creatures as well as to that of all creation. If, therefore, any injury has been done to or threatens either the common good or the interests of individual groups, which injury cannot in any other way be repaired or prevented, it is necessary for public authority to intervene.—*Rerum Novarum*, N. 52.



Soviet Totalitarianism

The enslavement of man despoiled of his rights, the denial of the transcendental origin of the State and its authority, the horrible abuse of public power in the service of a collectivistic terrorism are the very contrary of all that corresponds with natural ethics and the will of the Creator.—*On Atheistic Communism*, N. 33.

Catholics and the Social Encyclicals

ROBERT C. HARTNETT, S.J.

Reprinted from AMERICA*

CATHOLICS in the United States have been exposed ever since about 1940 to a rather dangerous temptation. Events since that time have exerted a powerful pull to distract them from the study and application of the social encyclicals. The sixtieth anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* and the twentieth of Pope Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno* on May 15 might well occasion an examination of conscience to see to what extent we may have succumbed to that temptation.

When Pope Pius XI promulgated his rich compendium of Catholic socio-economic teaching in 1931, the world was in the throes of the "great depression." The world-wide economic breakdown was itself, of course, "abnormal," at least in the minds of most people. To Pope Pius XI, however, as spokesman for those who, through at least two generations, had devoted themselves to the study of modern industrial society, the depression was in some ways merely the awful culmination of certain trends which had always worked toward the undermining of industrial society. The Holy Father was able, as a consequence, to gain a widespread hear-

ing for his analysis of the causes of social disorder. He was also able to gain a hearing for the far-reaching remedies which he proposed.

In contrast to the earlier encyclical of Leo XIII, therefore, *Quadragesimo Anno* quickly became an object of interest and study to tens of thousands of Catholics in the United States, and even to many non-Catholics. The "social encyclicals" became a widely used phrase. Yet one could hardly say that the teaching of the Popes sank very deeply into the consciousness of Catholics as a whole. If we remember that *Q.A.* was a *compendium*—a condensation, packed with profound ideas—of Catholic socio-economic teaching, we shall not be surprised that only the exceptional Catholic was both "willing and able" to digest its meaning.

Study clubs, it is true, were formed. Labor schools sprang up. Catholic graduate schools found more and more students, chiefly among priests, brothers and sisters preparing to teach in Catholic institutions, enrolling in courses in the social encyclicals. Something like a real Catholic "social movement" was in the making.

Even in the 1930's, I think, the for-

*70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y., May 12, 1951

ward march of this movement ran into a serious snag. The Rooseveltian New Deal proved to be of more immediate interest to most Catholics than the long-range study of *Q.A.* American Catholics, therefore, divided into pro-New Deal and anti-New Deal wings. Whenever you started to discuss *Q.A.* with anybody, he interrupted: "You aren't a New Dealer, are you?" It was practically impossible to keep Papal social teaching independent of current political controversy. Looking back, I would be the last to say, in my own case as well as that of many others, that students of the social encyclicals made a very heroic effort to keep the New Deal and Papal social teaching separate. Whether it would have been better for us to have tried to do so is a question I cannot even attempt to answer. The simple fact is, in my opinion, that the Catholic social movement got bogged down in the controversy raging over the New Deal.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION IN THE COLLEGES

Another fact is undeniable. Generally speaking, Catholic colleges (I have no information on the high-school situation) made very little, if any, effort to reach *all* their students with new courses in the social encyclicals. To my mind, this is still true. Rev. William G. Downing, S.J.'s statistical study ("*Q.A.* in the classroom," AM. 9/10/49, pp. 604-8) has

rather conclusively proved this fact.

Catholic colleges, like most institutions, tend to perpetuate older, "tried and true" ways of doing things. That is the inestimable advantage of an institution: it has momentum, and can preserve what experience has proven to be of great value, without incessant deflection by ephemeral trends. Institutionalism, however, like every human good, has its vices as well as its virtues. One of its vices is what sociologists call "inertia." To my mind our colleges have still failed to adjust themselves to the importance of the Papal encyclicals published in our generation.

It was the year 1940, however, that brought the real damage to the American Catholic social movement. The defense program in that year lifted us out of the doldrums of unemployment and poverty. The war brought a flush of artificial prosperity which made discussions of "a family living wage" seem very old hat.

Since 1945, a somewhat different situation has thrown Catholic social teaching into an eclipse. Fortunately, the postwar "depression" did not materialize. The satisfaction of pent-up material needs brought on a postwar prosperity. Then the threat of Soviet Communism began to absorb our entire attention. As Bishop Ready of Columbus, Ohio, clearly implied in addressing the Catholic Press Association last year, fighting the "malaria"

of Communism has pushed the social encyclicals off-stage: "We seldom see, these days, the glowing name of Social Justice, which was once frequently mentioned in our press" (*Catholic Mind*, August, 1950, p. 454). The sober truth is, I fear, that people who are prospering under an economic system cannot easily be persuaded to study its defects in the light of Catholic social teaching. The encyclicals have, therefore, been left unread by many who are in an ideal position to apply them in their business, professional and civic careers.

SOCIAL VIRTUES

Father Masse, in the preceding article, has already indicated the social evils to which the great encyclicals were addressed. He has also pointed up the "headlines" of the Catholic social teaching propounded in them. All I wish to do here is say a few words about a phase of the encyclicals which is seldom discussed.

What is regarded as the fourth part of *Q.A.* is devoted to the "renewal of the Christian spirit," without which Pope Pius XI said social peace could never be established. The central message of the encyclical, as Father Masse has shown, is based on "reason," enriched by the Church's 1900 years of experience. The last part is devoted, one might say, to *motivation*. Those who regard the "profit motive" as the all-sufficient "incentive" in economic life would do well

to ponder Pope Pius XI's substantially different teaching.

1. First of all, we must substitute a Christian perspective for "that excessive care for passing things that is the origin of all vices. . . ." Our Divine Lord taught us that "the cares and riches and pleasures of life" choked the good seed He spread among souls. How true this is of the social teaching of Christ's Spouse, the Catholic Church! What good, asks the Holy Father, are "sound principles of economic life" if men's passions are swept away "in unbridled and sordid greed"? The Pope is addressing Catholics. He deplors the extent to which they have fallen victims of "greed for gain." "The sordid love of wealth" is labeled by Pope Pius XI "the shame and great sin of our age." The great Christian virtue which should control this passion, of course, is *temperance*, or "Christian moderation." How many Catholics are there who think this virtue applies only to indulgence in food and drink?

2. "Social justice" is the virtue around which, one could almost say, Catholic social doctrine is built. Ordinary justice, as between individuals, requires honesty and fair-dealing, such as the payment of a living wage and an "honest day's work" for it. "Now it is of the very essence of social justice to demand from each individual [and "each single part"] all that is necessary for the common

good" declared Pope Pius XI in 1937.

Most people realize what is meant by the term *maldistribution of wealth*. They instinctively know that some kind of *proportion* should exist in the possession of worldly goods. This is the sort of equality the virtue of social justice looks to—an equality of proper proportion in the distribution of wealth, based on people's human needs and their social contributions.

The *test* of whether a Catholic's thinking is permeated by this virtue is simple. When you are discussing social problems with non-Catholics (at least with *some* non-Catholics), do they interrupt you and say: "Of course, you are looking at this problem from the point of view of social justice. I suppose I am not. That is the difference between us"? If you do not think in terms of social justice, you hardly possess the virtues the Church expects of you.

This virtue applies, not only to industrial relations, but to housing, racial discrimination and all similar problems directly affecting the common welfare. A day hardly passes when an ordinary citizen does not discuss a question involving social justice.

3. "Charity," or what Pope Pius XI also calls "social charity," which is "universal," must always take a "leading role" in effecting social reconstruction. Justice, whether "strict" or "social," can more easily measure out what is due to the respective part-

ners in any social economy—local, regional, national or international. But the spirit of Christian love is needed to inspire us to carry out the demands of justice. It is true, "no vicarious charity can substitute for justice. . . ." But the attitude of Christian brotherhood can and must incline us to be generous in fulfilling the requirements of justice. Besides, there are many occasions in which social virtues closely associated with charity, such as mercy, supply what is wanting in the demands of justice.

WHAT DO WE STAND FOR?

The Holy Father deplores the number of those "who, professing to be Catholics, are almost completely unmindful of the sublime law of justice and charity. . . ." The encyclical is, therefore, pointedly addressed even to "good" Catholics. If they wonder whether they are carrying out the heavy obligations Pope Pius XI has set forth as binding upon them, they might simply ask themselves: "How much is it *costing me*, in terms of dollars and cents, to be a *socially* practising Catholic?" If the very query seems strange, that only shows how far we have left the Church's social doctrines on the margins of our daily thinking.

"Catholics," declares the Boston *Pilot*, diocesan weekly, for April 28, especially have a reputation for conservatism which some of us would like to think is undeserved. . . . The great

pity here is that we have not been wanting in leadership, but simply reluctant in responding to its demands.

We are *against* a lot of things. But what do we stand *for*? There isn't the

slightest excuse for our not knowing what the Church expects us to stand for. It is not enough to blame our schools. We can read. Now is the time to start doing so.



Just Distribution

Not every distribution among human beings of property and wealth is of a character to attain either completely or to a satisfactory degree of perfection the end which God intends. Therefore, the riches that economic-social developments constantly increase ought to be so distributed among individual persons and classes that the common advantage of all, which Leo XIII had praised, will be safeguarded; in other words, that the common good of all society will be kept inviolate. By this law of social justice, one class is forbidden to exclude the other from sharing in the benefits. Hence the class of the wealthy violates this law no less, when, as if free from care on account of its wealth, it thinks it the right order of things for it to get everything and the worker nothing, than does the non-owning working class when, angered deeply at outraged justice and too ready to assert wrongly the one right it is conscious of, it demands for itself everything as if produced by its own hands, and attacks and seeks to abolish, therefore, all property and returns or incomes, of whatever kind they are or whatever the function they perform in human society, that have not been obtained by labor, and for no other reason save that they are of such a nature.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 57.



Not Pie in the Sky

The Church does not separate a proper regard for temporal welfare from solicitude for the eternal. If she subordinates the former to the latter according to the words of her divine Founder, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you," she is nevertheless so far from hindering civil progress and material advancement, that she actually fosters and promotes them in the most sensible and efficacious manner.—*On Atheistic Communism*, N. 34.

Religion and the Decline of Capitalism

THE REV. J. H. DARBY

Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX*

PROFESSOR TAWNEY, in 1922, gave a course of lectures on "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," in the 16th and 17th centuries, whilst in 1950 Canon V. A. Demant, of Christ Church, Oxford, has lately completed a series of eight lectures, given in the Third Program of the B.B.C., on "Religion and the Decline of Capitalism."

As in a previous article ("The Economic Rationalization of Industry" *Christus Rex*, October 1949) I attempted to set out the rise of Capitalism, as explained by the Catholic Professor Fanfani, it may be worth while to study what an Anglican lecturer has to say about the decline of this phase of modern industrialism. It is quite clear that Canon Demant's theological outlook is essentially Catholic, for it is markedly Incarnational and Sacramental. One result of this is that he is in agreement with Fanfani's general thesis and, indeed, quotes him. But the Canon's aim, so to speak, is to begin where Fanfani ends, and to discuss the present state of economic rationalization in 1950.

Throughout his lectures Canon Demant never loses sight of the Christian Faith, for he is convinced

that the Incarnation of the Son of God provides the only possible solution to that innate conflict in human nature itself which, owing to the decline of the Faith in the West, has landed us today in such dismal social confusion. God made human nature with its matter and spirit elements. Both are good but reconcilable only in Him, and apart from Him the egoism and the social instincts are bound to cause the kind of social chaos in which it is our misfortune to live today.

Like Professor Fanfani the Canon finds it difficult to put in a few words what exactly this modern thing Capitalism really is.

It is the Canon's thesis that the 18th century economic philosophers whose dogmas were lived out in the 19th century on the lines of "laissez faire," the free market and the like, are today not only challenged but abandoned as out-moded. The State is no longer content to hold the ring and to give the merchant complete freedom of action; on the contrary, it has stepped in, even in the U.S.A., with all sorts of controls which are unconcerned with economics. This is a return to pre-Capitalist days, but

* Main St., Naas, Eire, October, 1950.

with an important difference. Up to the 18th century such interference with the merchant was due to an ethical code founded on Christianity, whereas today government control has its inspiration in Socialist theory.

SOCIOLOGICAL ABNORMALITIES

It is Canon Demant's opinion that Capitalism became an ambiguous as well as a controversial word when men began reading Marx's *Das Kapital*, but the first lecture attempts to pin down its modern meaning by three definitions: a) a form of economic organization, b) the inspiration of a culture, and c) a relation of the material universe to human existence. Now Socialism may kill a, the organization, retain b, i.e. the capitalist culture, whilst c, the non-Christian humanism of the 18th century, may continue to flourish, and in the Canon's view all three are sociological abnormalities since they loosen or break things like kinship, village community life, as well as the sanctions of Christian morality. Enormous social dislocations take place when labor, land and money itself become *marketable*, subject to the law of supply and demand. Readers of Bagehot, the 19th century economist and a supporter of "laissez faire," must be surprised by his frank admission in *Physics and Politics* of a "pre-economic age when the very assumptions of political economy did not exist, when its precepts

would have been ruinous and when the very contrary precepts were requisite and wise."

As a further contribution towards defining Capitalism the Canon quotes from Christopher Dawson, who calls it "the vast system of financial, commercial and industrial relations which we know as the capitalist order." It is manifest that if Capitalism is an "order" it must have a philosophy of some kind, some sense of its place in the scheme of things, and not only do these Lectures make clear what that philosophical outlook was, but also Dr. Demant's strong objection to it as being anti-Christian. This philosophy sounds very odd today. We get some idea of it in Lecture II, for professedly Christian men in the 1820's were able to ascribe the whole complex economic system to a beneficent Providence and describe it as proclaiming His glory. The 18th century Anglican Archbishop Whately is quoted in this Lecture (p. 873) as saying: "It is curious to observe how through a wise and beneficent arrangement of Providence men thus do the greatest service to the public when they are thinking of nothing but their own gains." In the 19th century such an outlook, a little less naively expressed, perhaps, came to be known as liberal economics and seems to have had the support, as we have seen, of the *Economist* and its editor, Walter Bagehot.

Indeed, in his third Lecture the

Canon has a good look at this liberal humanism of the 19th century which was so favorable to the new Capitalism. It was a queer mixture of good and bad, of false and true. There was a disinterested search for truth; a frank acceptance of Christian notions of right and wrong; the Christian teaching that Law was above governments; and further, the value of man *as man*, a peculiarly Christian idea, was accepted almost as an axiom. It may well be asked if this is liberal humanism why did Newman spend so much time in his "University Sermons" in fighting it? In a word, and recognizing the danger in all over-simplifications, one may reply that this liberal humanism was Christianity with Christ left out, although there were quite a lot of pious Christians, especially of the Evangelical School, who failed to realize this. This economic-liberal view of life was an ignoring, a quiet dropping, of the supernatural; the whole concern was with this life here and now.

Furthermore, this Manchester School of 19th century liberalism was not local and English only; it was a menace to the Faith on the Continent. As early as 1869 the German Catholic Bishop Ketteler charged liberal economics with responsibility for the social evils of the day; and in doing so he is but echoing in restrained language what Marx and Engels were fulminating in the *Com-*

munist Manifesto, which attacked the "bourgeoisie" for putting an end to "patriarchal idyllic relations," for tearing asunder "feudal ties," and for leaving "no other bond between man and man than naked self-interest and callous cash payment." What Marx and Engels omitted to state was contained in Bishop Ketteler's assertion that *laissez-faire* economics could flourish quite well in a bureaucratic State!

CHRISTIANITY WITHOUT CHRIST

The earlier thinkers of this new school of economics never tired of asserting that this free market idea was according to Nature, was, so to say, in the very nature of things, whereas even the modern economist admits that it was only in the nature of things *at that time*. What is even more naive is the confidence of men of the calibre of Adam Smith, Jefferson of America, Bentham and others that their ethical code was *natural* to man, whereas it is demonstrably an outcome of the Catholic tradition of Europe. These two false premises had some very serious consequences, for whereas in the 1850's men who thoroughly believed in these economic-liberal ideas never thought of "missing Church" on Sundays, their children who took their places were by no means so regular, and by the turn of the century Christian standards were slipping badly. It was only to be ex-

pected. Christianity without Christ meant that English morality was living on its past and today it is near bankruptcy.

Canon Demant blames the new Capitalism, not of course for the decline of religion among English Protestants, but for its breaking up of the frame-work of society which had been built up through the centuries by Christian influences. In fact, he agrees with the criticism by Bishop Ketteler and the *Communist Manifesto* referred to above, and adds a similar judgment made by Professor Röpke. This modern economist supports Capitalism, but blames the earlier masters for neglecting the fact that a man is more than a wage-earner since he has vital interests in his home, neighbors and in his country, and the professor admits the consequent breakdown. Capitalism, Canon Demant declares, can only offer bargaining facilities in place of the older springs of life supplied by religion, chivalric adventure, ascetic self-denial and all the rest of the European heritage; he quotes a "bon mot" from Schumpeter: "The Stock Exchange is a poor substitute for the Holy Grail."

The fact is that the human spirit transcends this earth and must have, and is for ever seeking contacts with, something itself spiritual which the Christian knows as the Divine Majesty. If man acknowledges this we call him religious; but as the Canon

so truly points out, if he refuses to worship he can be a rebel, a devil. Without an anchorage in God man must go on drifting to and fro between materialism and idealism.

BREAK-UP OF CIVILIZATION

These generalizations about Capitalism, its place as a passing phase in European history, its tendency to disrupt society, form a sort of prolegomena to an examination of the forces which are today at fighting odds in our decaying civilization. In its editorial comment on Canon Demant's first lecture, the *Listener* over-simplifies the issue by suggesting that the private capitalism of the 19th century has become the state capitalism of today. But surely the Canon is not merely concerned with the feud between Private Enterprise and Socialism, but with the much more fundamental question of Christianity in face of the break-up of civilization; a priority duty of the Church is the provision of a new form of apologetic in view of the entirely new challenge. It is no mere matter of protecting the worker against the worst effects of the Industrial Revolution. That has already been done; and both the town factory-hands and the country farm laborers are to day living in clover as compared with the impoverished middle classes. To that extent it may be asserted that the Papal encyclicals have accomplished their aim; but

they are by no means out of date, for their insistence on the dignity of the human person is much more necessary today against the totalitarian state than ever it was against 19th century factory owners.

Canon Demant wants to see European society on its feet again after its very serious illness, and as he sees it neither the mild Socialism of England nor the very strong medicine of Bolshevism is healing the wounds inflicted on society by modern capitalism. Socialism in all its forms tends to make the State into a sort of Church by arrogating to itself all social and cultural activities, with the bizarre result that the totalitarian state is "moral" whereas the 18-19th century liberal secular state was a-moral. The Roman Empire of Augustus (note the significance of "Augustus") took the same path for precisely similar reasons, viz., to keep society together and to prevent its break-up. Christianity gave man a status in the universe and the secular state has to follow suit as best it can. Even if one has to use inverted commas, Bolshevism must be reckoned with as a "religion." Even the Duce dared to call Fascism a *spiritual* force, including morals.

Accordingly the Canon lays down what amounts to a Christian apologetic suitable to these days. It is most important to put into up-to-date language (or should one say "jar-

gon"?) that the stress caused by the two-fold make-up of man can only be resolved by an outside force, which must be some form of religion, of which history shows Christianity as the most successful. Why this stress produced such remarkable enterprise, devotion and even ruthless progress in Europe is another question and a most interesting one for the historian. The fact is that the Catholic Church kept this ruthlessness within bounds, and the loss of the Faith has turned this healthy stress into a deadly poison. To lose faith in God is to lose the key to man's duality; the secular state, whether liberal or totalitarian, is locked up in the dark; the earthly plane cannot possibly possess the means for escaping from the impasse of today's ideologies.

INCENTIVE

But the problem is to state an apologia dealing with the supernatural in terms understandable by an age which blandly assumes as axiomatic that man is a part of nature; that and nothing more. Again, how (asks Canon Demant) can European society be kept going until the revival of the Faith, of which there are many hopeful signs, brings back the old incentives in its train? Both in Russia and in Europe the government is faced with apathy among the workers. Now laziness is innate in all of us; man has always needed

an incentive to get on with the job, but the urge has never been solely the need for food. Hunger is certainly no incentive in the modern Welfare State, but *status* is, and governments today are working hopefully along the path of partnership between master and man in profits, planning and responsibility. The irresponsible man at the coal-face soon makes enough money for his week's needs and naturally "plays" the rest of the week; the call for leisure is stronger than the need of money. But the same man is quite prepared to go on working if he is offered certain other incentives which come under the head of status. That is one suggestion which the Canon makes in the natural order, i.e., a means open even to a secular state as a help towards keeping civilization going.

Society, in the Canon's view, is always sick in the sense that it is never free from destructive forces. Civilization anywhere in the world is always a superstructure, and is bound to sag when its hidden foundations decay. The ultimate fate of the Russian experiment depends on the way in which her old tribal, non-liberal foundations react to the importing of Western techniques, for it is more than likely that these will rot the foundations as they did in Europe and finally disrupt Russian society, and already the Russian peasantry seem to be showing an in-

stinctive dislike to collectivization on the land.

But civilization of some sort is "natural" to man, for if his story begins in a Garden, it ends, according to the Bible, in a City, and although civilization may be his glory, it can also be his tragedy; for the Christian on pilgrimage to his City it can never be more than a comfortable inn and a road free from banditry. So it follows that the modern secular state must find some substitute for that "feeling at home" and neighborliness which in Catholic Europe was naturally produced by the Faith.

PURPOSE IN LIFE

Can the secular state of today do anything else to keep our civilization alive? Canon Demant suggests three possibilities, of which the first is that somehow urban and rural life must be brought to an understanding of each other; they must form a civilization *between* them. The factory-hand is too often ignorant of his absolute dependence on the land for his food—rather like the disgust of the town child with milk out of a cow which she watched being milked; she preferred her milk out of a nice, clean can! The Canon's second point has already been dealt with, the need to create a sense of community. His third may easily be guessed, for it is religion. The spiritual urge in man is for something

more than wages and comfort, something of a *purpose* in life which will help him over the drab patches. Now it has to be faced that Communism, whether in Russia, in "schismatic" Yugoslavia, or in Paris, does give men, whether working-class or intellectuals, a sort of mystic purpose and does provide a "religion" of a sort. Whatever that mysterious something is, it is earth-bound, and to the Christian, the whole set-up of the secular state looks uncommonly like a parody of the Catholic Church, what St. John would have called Anti-Christ and Babylon. The closing sentence of the Canon's seventh Lecture suggests that capitalist society and today's Socialist reactions to it are but two phases in a civilization in decay which may easily get worse until there are sufficient men of spiritual outlook to build the new Europe. Both Canon Demant and Christopher Dawson are pessimistic about today,

but they are both Christian men as well as good Europeans, and they look to the Faith to restore the West. It is many years ago since Hilaire Belloc declared that "Europe is the Faith and the Faith is Europe," and many more today see the truth of that prophetic book of his, the *Servile State*, for they have proved from their own experience that where the Faith falters, the *Servile State* marches in. The question is not, of course, whether civilization is possible without Christianity; there were many quite stable civilizations before the Christian era; but whether Europe, which owed its culture so largely to the Faith, can continue to exist as a *post-Christian entity*, for the Christian ethic there is still strong enough to balk the efforts being made to turn it into the *Servile State*. The return to the Faith of Europe's leaders may yet save its civilization.



Mutual Dependence of Labor and Capital

Hence it follows that unless a man is expending labor on his own property, the labor of one person and the property of another must be associated, for neither can produce anything without the other. Leo XIII certainly had this in mind when he wrote: "Neither capital can do without labor, nor labor without capital." Wherefore it is wholly false to ascribe to property alone or to labor alone whatever has been obtained through the combined effort of both, and it is wholly unjust for either, denying the efficacy of the other, to arrogate to itself whatever has been produced.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 53.

The Revolutionary Encyclical

R. J. MILLER, C.Ss.R.

Associate Editor of *The Liguorian*

Reprinted from *THE LIGUORIAN**

RERUM NOVARUM is a papal encyclical which was addressed to the world sixty years ago, on May 15, 1891, by Pope Leo XIII. The Roman practice, in such papal letters, is that the opening words suggest the subject to be treated. *Casti Connubii*, for instance, (meaning "of chaste wedlock") is a papal letter on marriage; *Libertas* deals with human liberty, etc. But the opening words of this letter on the condition of workmen are *Rerum Novarum*; and these two words represent a classical Latin phrase for "revolution."

Of course, the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* has been viewed as a very revolutionary document by many persons ever since it first appeared. There is the story of the old gentleman in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City when it was being read from the pulpit in 1891. As the reading progressed, he became more and more restless, and finally got up and walked out of the church, murmuring audibly as he went: "Socialism! Socialism!"

But *Rerum Novarum* was published as a plan of campaign against Socialist and Communist revolution,

and no one recognizes it as such more definitely than the Communists themselves.

In fact, the Pope's use of the term "revolution" at the very beginning of the encyclical, if taken in its immediate context, refers only in a descriptive way to the spread of the revolutionary spirit between the years 1620 and 1891. He is saying in effect that the modern spirit of revolution, which began in the realm of religion with the Protestant revolution in the 1500's, and then passed to the field of politics with the French Revolution in 1789, had finally spread to labor and economic relations by 1891.

Needless to say, the Popes were opposed to the religious revolt or revolution of the 1600's, and no less to the excesses of the French political revolution; nor does the Communist social and economic revolution of the 1800's find any Papal approval in the *Rerum Novarum* of 1891.

But there is a sense in which *Rerum Novarum* deserves its title: it is an appeal to a very special kind of revolution. It is a counter revolution against the minimizing of human dignity and the enslavement of the

* *Liguori, Mo., May, 1951.*

workingman that had followed upon the industrial revolution. But it is far more than that. It is an important part of a vast project being promoted by the papacy: a magnificent campaign which only the papacy could envision or achieve, namely, *to renew the face of the earth*.

PLAN OF CAMPAIGN

Amid all the discussions and arguments, all the applications of principle to fact, all the possible viewpoints that might be taken on *Rerum Novarum*, this one must be kept in mind as giving perspective and power to all the others: *Rerum Novarum* is the plan of campaign on one particular front in the Catholic Church's vast campaign to renew the face of the earth.

It was a favorite thought with Pope Leo XIII, and he seems to have taken it from St. Augustine (who lived in the 4th and 5th centuries), that while the Catholic Church was founded by Jesus Christ mainly to bring other-worldly benefits to mankind, it has power to do so much good for this world, and has actually done so much good, that an observer might think it was founded for the welfare of this world alone.

Consider some of its achievements in this world: the abolition of human slavery; the true emancipation of woman from her pagan inferiority to the dignity she enjoys in Christian chivalry and culture; the civilization

of the barbarians; the preservation of Europe from complete domination by the Mohammedans; the salvaging of the classic culture of Greece and Rome from the Dark Ages; the institution of representative government and civil liberties; the initiation and development of the modern university; the institution of the workingmen's guilds, which gave self-respect and status to labor and put order into business life; and the harmonious moulding of all these institutions and accomplishments into a unified social order. All these blessings and a good many more the world owes to the Catholic Church and the papacy.

But the Church and the papacy have not been completely free to exercise their beneficent influence through the centuries. Human weakness and human malice, rulers with totalitarian ambitions, unworthy children, to say nothing of foes beyond this world, the ancient enemy of the human race who begrudges it every crumb of consolation even in this vale of tears: these have been the obstructionists to the success of the Church's work for the peace and relative happiness of men in this world.

At times their obstructing influence was held back, as, for instance, during the years 1050 to 1275, an era of unparalleled peace and prosperity in the annals of the human race. At other times all the evil forces of earth

and-hell seemed to be let loose against the Church, and were even allowed in God's Providence to destroy some of the good she had done for mankind. An example is the period of wild revolution cited by Pope Leo XIII in the opening paragraph of *Rerum Novarum*, 1620 to 1891.

FROM DEATH TO LIFE

It is a matter of historical record, however, that the Church has actually changed the face of the earth in the past. Pope Leo puts it about as strongly as possible, when he says in *Rerum Novarum*:

On this subject we need only recall for one moment the record of history. Of these things there cannot be the shadow of doubt, namely, that civil society was renovated in every part by Christian institutions; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things—nay, that it was brought back from death to life, and to so excellent a life that nothing more perfect had been known before or will come to pass in the ages that are yet to be.

Strong words, indeed! "Nothing more perfect had been known before or will come to pass in the ages that are yet to be."

Think of what the Church actually did! Every natural institution in Europe felt the vitalizing power of its influence: marriage, education, higher learning; the improvement of the mind, and the exercise of human freedom; then, too, labor conditions, business competition, civic and po-

litical life, the broad field of international relations.

Of these things there cannot be the shadow of doubt . . . that the human race was lifted up to better things—nay, that it was brought back from death to life.

But then, just when the influence of the Church seemed about to succeed in welding or moulding a Christendom that would endure, something happened. In some way it seems that the world was not ready for the fullness of that vision of peace. Hilaire Belloc says in his book, *Europe and the Faith*:

The full causes of that failure cannot be analyzed. One may say that science and history were too slight; that the material side of life was insufficient; that the full knowledge of the past which is necessary to permanence was lacking—or one may say that the ideal was too high for men. I for my part incline to believe that wills other than those of mortals were in combat for the souls of individual men, and that in this spiritual battle, fought over our heads perpetually, some accident of the struggle turned it against us for a time. If that suggestion be fantastic, which no doubt it is, at any rate none other is complete.

Anyway, the Church was obstructed in her work by various factors, all of which may be said to have something diabolical about them: in the 1300's, the exile of the Popes in France; in the 1400's, the "black death" which carried away one-third of the population, and in some places more than half the priests and re-

ligious; then the great schism, when there were three men claiming to be Pope at the same time.

Finally, came the revolution: revolution against religious authority in the 1600's; revolution against political and civil authority in the 1800's; and revolution for revolution's sake by the Communists in the 1900's.

The result was that the Church's influence for good was weakened all along the line. Marriage, education, higher learning, philosophy, human liberty, were all invaded by the enemy of human happiness, became disrupted and corrupted with sophistry, hatred, confusion, delinquency. So too the condition of labor, business competition, politics and international relations literally seemed to have "gone to the devil." There is far more truth than snappy wisecrack in that statement as applied to the condition of human institutions when Leo XIII became Pope in 1878.

The Church, which in the past had seen her benign power pervade these institutions not only for the salvation of souls but also for the peace of men here below, now beheld these same institutions—marriage, education, business life, political relations, labor conditions—invaded and claimed in large part for its own by a spirit that was openly hostile to the salvation of souls, and unmistakably productive of chaos and misery in this world.

Among observers of this trend in history there were not wanting those who claimed that the Church had failed; that her work was done; she was dying or dead and soon would be a thing of the hopeless past.

A RESURRECTION

But then, amazingly, came the resurrection. The Church arose from her seeming deathbed or her tomb, and under Leo XIII and his successors set about the gigantic task of reconquering the ground lost to the enemy. "The reconstruction of the social order" was their magnificent objective; the renewal of the face of the earth, the bringing back from death to life, not only of the papacy, which had not been dead but only in bondage, but of the world, of human institutions blighted and blasted as they had become when wrested from her by the enemy.

The Church had done it before, and the Church was setting about doing it again: only there was a striking difference. The bringing back from death to life which she accomplished for the world a thousand years ago was done, so to speak, unconsciously, as an overflow of the fullness of her own inward life and her daily work of vivifying souls for life everlasting. Now she was, and she is, setting about the task again, this time in full consciousness of her power and with the objective set clearly before her: the reconstruction

of the social order in all its elements. Marriage, education, the flowering of the mind and the glory of human freedom; labor relations, business life; civic, political, international order—the vast network of all man's social relationships was to be reconquered for Christ and for human happiness.

Initiatives were set under way, forces organized, orders given. Papal directives were issued detailing the objectives, prescribing the moves in the campaign, calling all men of good will to join in the tremendous and inspiring crusade for the renewal of the face of the earth. Encyclicals and other Papal pronouncements on marriage, on education, on human reason in its higher aspects, and human freedom, "God's greatest gift to men"; on labor conditions, business relations, civic virtue and international peace, all are part of the campaign. Each Papal pronouncement assigns the task to be done in order to reclaim a particular section of the social order from the powers of darkness and to reconstruct it for the happiness of mankind in the next world and for his peaceful sojourning in this.

In this breath-taking panorama, this resurrection from disordered revolution, the place of *Rerum Novarum* is of particular importance. It constitutes the fundamental briefing or plan of campaign for clearing the forces of hatred and unnatural strife

from the relations of workers and employers; for restoring human labor to its God-given dignity; and for building constructively and positively a social order for labor relations in which the central motive will be, not opposition, but friendly and intelligent co-operation. Despite the fact that its principles were long in seeping into the minds of men, even Christian men, despite the fact that yet today there are those who still promote the disastrous social and economic principles that flourished before 1891, *Rerum Novarum* marked a sharp turning point in the whole history of modern labor relations. The world cannot go back to the selfishness and chaos that prevailed before this encyclical on the condition of labor appeared.

This is indeed a perspective to cheer and inspire the human heart. If it were proposed by anyone but the Church and the Popes, with their age-old experience, their divine resources, and the successes of the past to stand them surety, it might seem a campaign too lofty for human striving. But with that surety, it becomes a program for practical action based on practical experience and backed by divine assistance. Even the failures of the past, insofar as they were failures, with their mysterious background of struggles with forces beyond this world, are an invitation to serve on the side of the angels and the Popes, to put aside

petty personalities and private ambitions, and, in the case of *Rerum Novarum* in particular, to take the papal directives wholeheartedly and in one's own sphere to work and sacrifice and pray and fight for the defeat of the powers of darkness and the renewal of the face of the earth.



Capital and Labor

It is a capital evil with respect to the question We are discussing to take for granted that the one class of society is of itself hostile to the other, as if nature had set rich and poor against each other to fight fiercely in implacable war. This is so abhorrent to reason and truth that the exact opposite is true; for just as in the human body the different members harmonize with one another, whence arises that disposition of parts and proportion in the human figure rightly called symmetry, so likewise nature has commanded in the case of the State that the two classes mentioned should agree harmoniously and should properly form equally balanced counterparts to each other. Each needs the other completely: neither capital can do without labor, nor labor without capital.—*Rerum Novarum*, N. 28.



Preserve Private Ownership

If incentives to ingenuity and skill in individual persons were to be abolished, the very fountains of wealth would necessarily dry up; and the equality conjured up by the Socialist imagination would, in reality, be nothing but uniform wretchedness and meanness for one and all, without distinction.

From all these considerations, it is perceived that the fundamental principle of Socialism which would make all possessions public property is to be utterly rejected because it injures the very ones whom it seeks to help, contravenes the natural rights of individual persons, and throws the functions of the State and public peace into confusion. Let it be regarded, therefore, as established that in seeking help for the masses this principle before all is to be considered as basic, namely, that private ownership must be preserved inviolate.—*Rerum Novarum*, N. 22, 23.

Not Statism, Not Socialism

HON. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

SIXTY years ago the great Pope Leo XIII issued his encyclical on the "Condition of Labor." And twenty years ago, as the great depression of the 'thirties gripped the world, Pope Pius XI issued the sequel to Pope Leo's letter on "Reconstructing the Social Order."

The leadership which the Catholic Church has given to social progress, as a result of these two great directives, is recognized and respected by all men of good will everywhere. The profound influence for good which these writings have exerted is a fact which can be recognized by all men, regardless of doctrinal differences.

Michigan is a land of many kinds of people. And we have made substantial gains toward that reconstruction of society which Pius XI urged. Our industrial workers, once virtually slaves to the assembly line, have been able to "secure . . . an increase in the goods of body, of soul and of prosperity." They have organized themselves into great unions. We have survived the period of growing pains on the part of those labor organizations, and the period of vigorous opposition on the part of employers. Things are certainly not yet perfect, and a great deal remains to be done. But through the processes

The following is the text of the address by the Governor of Michigan delivered at the rally honoring the Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and Pius XI, May 15, at Marygrove College, Detroit. A few short passages of the Governor's address have been deleted because of space limitations.

of practical democracy, we are on the way to a peaceful and harmonious operation of our industrial society.

That progress certainly could not have been made without the active collaboration of the Catholic Church, influencing as she does the hearts and consciences of so many of our people.

First of all, let me say that the great contribution of the Papal encyclicals is a moral contribution. Through the voices of Pope Pius XI and Leo XIII the Catholic Church has done a great deal to reestablish the relation between social questions and morality. And that is a great contribution indeed: because our difficulties have not resulted necessarily from our conquest of nature; they have resulted rather from the effort to enjoy and exploit that conquest without respect for moral law.

This attempt first took the form of a pseudo-science which purported to

deal with certain alleged immutable economic laws. These economic laws were cited as the reason why industrialism had to be accompanied by misery for the greater part of the human race. Scientific achievements, which should have brought an era of unparalleled prosperity were allowed to produce instead mass poverty and unhappiness. "Dead matter," said Pius XI, "leaves the factory ennobled and transformed," while "men are corrupted and degraded."

The same un-moral approach to industrial, economic and social problems resulted in the effort to solve international issues by military power alone. We have had two world wars to prove the bankruptcy of that policy. And, finally, we have seen the effort to win prosperity without morality result in the rise of Communism, with its present threat to the liberties of free people all over the world.

THE MORAL LAW

The voice of the Vatican, raised in denunciation of this amoral and immoral approach, was profoundly influential in bringing the world to its senses. Today we do not question the fact that issues of right and wrong must be considered in our social policy, along with questions of profit and loss. The right of human beings to a living wage, the right to self-organization, child-labor laws, laws protecting women in industry, the re-

sponsibility of government for the common good, the responsibility to care for the unemployed and the unfortunate—these are things we accept today not only because they are good business in the long run, but because they are required by the moral law.

Our nation is founded upon a moral concept.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," says the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. . . . That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. . . ."

But during the last century we often forgot that the same principle is the foundation of liberty and decency in the economic as well as the political field. It was a good thing that the voice of the Vatican was raised to remind us that belief in God and His laws is not only the foundation of our political order, but also, as Pius XI said, "Belief in God is the unshakeable foundation of all social order."

The second great contribution of the Encyclicals was to redefine, in modern terms, the true place of government in our society.

This is a point on which men have been confused since the end of feudalism. The *laissez-faire* or "hands off" theory held that government was no more than a policeman, keeping or-

der among the citizens. If some of the citizens starved while others enriched themselves at the expense of the common good, that was regarded as a manifestation of economic law with which the government had no concern and no right to interfere.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

The evils spawned by this philosophy gave rise to opposite errors. Doctrinaire Socialists put forth the theory that the State alone was important, and that even the private ownership of property must be eradicated. From this error came the monstrous perversion of totalitarianism, in which the individual exists for the State, not the State for the individual. We have seen the pendulum swing wildly from the doctrine of government as policeman only to the doctrine of government as the be-all and end-all of human life. And we have seen the last error grow more terrible than the first, manifesting itself in Fascism, Nazism, and the nightmare of Communism which today threatens the world.

The true function of the State, of course, lies between these extremes. The State must be neither a mere policeman, nor must it absorb the human beings, families and private groups whose welfare it is ordained to serve.

With respect to ownership, the government must protect and encourage the citizens in the possession of pri-

vate property. At the same time, as Pius XI well pointed out, some forms of property ought to be publicly owned "because they carry with them an opportunity for domination too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large." This teaching we observe in the true American idea on property—that the land and the tools of production should be privately owned, except where public ownership may be necessary to prevent grave injury to the public welfare.

In restating this principle, the Popes not only exposed the fallacy of doctrinaire Socialism, but they gave the answer to those who go to the other extreme—those who see the spectre of Socialism in every legitimate effort of democratic government to serve the people's needs. A society of private ownership, guarded and perhaps regulated by the State, with public ownership restricted to those few fields where it is clearly necessary—that is the authentic American pattern. And the encyclicals have given it strong support.

With relation to the powers and scope of government, the encyclicals dealt a death blow to the theory of "*laissez-faire*." The business of government, said the Popes, is the welfare of human beings. Government must not only keep order among the citizens. It must also have a positive concern and care for the common wel-

fare, seeking out and meeting those needs which the people cannot meet by themselves alone. Whenever the common good is put in jeopardy, or any group's rights are being violated, the government must intervene.

This doctrine is not new. It is implicit in our Constitution, and was most aptly stated by Abraham Lincoln in a famous fragment found among his papers.

"The legitimate object of government," Lincoln said, "is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

At the same time, the encyclicals clearly upheld the principle of "subsidiarity," which is the foundation of all sound political science. The principle of "subsidiarity" is simply the logical principle that you don't kill flies with a shotgun or use a pile driver to fix the front screen. Government must do only those things which individuals cannot do for themselves. And the instrument must always be fitted to the task. Smaller units of society must be permitted to do the things they can do, and the larger agency must never assume duties which the smaller agency can perform. That simply means that it is wrong for government to do things which individuals can do better; it is wrong for public agencies to do things which private groups

can do; wrong for States to do things which counties or cities can do, and wrong for the Federal Government to do things which the States can do as well themselves.

There is nothing new about this either. It is also implicit in our system of division of powers, and checks and balances. Lincoln said it, too, in a final sentence at the end of the fragment I have just quoted:

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves," Lincoln wrote, "the government ought not to interfere."

Nevertheless, the restatement of these principles by the Vatican immensely strengthened the hand of those Americans who oppose statism and bureaucracy, but who want to see our government serve the new needs of the people.

F.D.R.'s LEADERSHIP

Under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the United States progressed rapidly toward the solution of those social evils which Leo XIII has so strongly condemned. The right of labor to organize, long denied by organized employers, was at last made the law of the land. Responsibility for those who are unemployed for economic reasons was recognized through unemployment insurance. The need for protection against poverty in old age was met with social security. Federal assistance was granted to the States in caring for those who

must depend upon public support. Laws to protect the economic welfare of farmers were passed. The national government has been empowered to guard the stability of our economy and to prevent or minimize depressions. In these and other great forward steps, the influence of Catholic thought, derived from the encyclical teaching, was a powerful factor.

One of the results has been that Communism, which once threatened to capture large segments of American labor, has been reduced to an impotent force, dangerous only by reason of the capacity of individual Communists for sabotage and treason.

FIELD FOR IMPROVEMENT

Much remains to be done, both nationally and in our State.

In our national policy, we must write a better labor law than the Taft-Hartley Act.

In our own State, there is (likewise) a great field for improvement. We need a fair employment practices law. We need a better balanced tax structure, bearing less heavily on the family budgets of ordinary people. We need better care for our aged citizens, for those afflicted with mental illness, and for others who are in our public care. We need a sound labor relations law, which will de-

pend upon cooperation and not upon repression for its effectiveness. We need legislation which can decently reconcile the rights of public employees with the rights of the public.

In all our policy we should never forget the words of Leo XIII: "All those measures ought to be favored which seem in any way capable of benefiting the condition of workers."

All of these needs can be met without danger of statism or Socialism by applying the time-tested principles of American democracy. These are the same principles regarding the function of government which were so ably stated by Leo XIII and Pius XI. As long as we adhere to those principles we can safely go forward, making our democracy serve our people more and more perfectly, and without fear of creating an all-powerful state.

The application of these principles in the form of social progress and a better life for all our people can have a profound influence on the course of human history. We have here in America an opportunity to demonstrate to the whole world that we can achieve both security and liberty in increasing degree. We have a chance to show, in actions which will speak louder than words, that democracy really works.

Let us, with God's help, measure up to that opportunity.

Social Encyclicals of the Pope

LISTON M. OAK

Text of a broadcast over the "Voice of America," May 9, 1951.

DURING this week American Catholic labor organizations and others will celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, an encyclical issued by Pope Leo XIII on May 15th, 1891. It is called "On the Condition of the Working Class." May 15th is also the twentieth anniversary of an encyclical issued by Pope Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, "On the Reconstruction of the Social Order." This developed further the basic principles enunciated by his predecessor, and called for fundamental social reforms.

These encyclicals have served as guidance for Catholics ever since, especially those active in the labor movement—and there are nearly 8,000,000 Catholic workers in American trade unions. The celebrations this week are under the auspices of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Catholic Labor Alliance, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, and other such organizations.

The present Pope, Pius XII, has often urged upon all Catholics the serious study of these encyclicals, and His Holiness has given interpretations of them in terms of present-day problems. Especially interesting is

his clarification of the attitude of the Church toward Capitalism, Socialism and Communism.

Pope Pius XII has publicly rejected any social order in which "the natural right to property, whether over consumers' goods or the means of production," is denied. But neither does the Church accept the kind of capitalism which arrogates to itself an unlimited right to use property without any subordination to the rights of others and the common good. The Holy Father has condemned as contrary to the natural law excessive accumulation of vast wealth in the hands of capitalists, and abuse of the power it gives them.

In exhorting the clergy to resist excessive capitalism, as well as atheistic Communism and materialistic Marxist Socialism, His Holiness was not condemning free enterprise. He was reasserting the principles laid down by his predecessors, Pope Leo XIII and Pius XI, who avoided the use of the term capitalism. This was because then, as now, the word cannot be precisely defined. It is variously understood in different parts of the world, and it is heavily overcharged with emotional overtones, due largely to Communist polemics.

What the papacy did condemn was 19th-century economic liberalism—the *laissez faire* individualistic system that led to social evils, such as great wealth for a few and poverty for the many—based upon a false concept of the right to private property. In this, the Church plainly implied that there are different kinds of capitalist systems. The three Popes insisted that the common welfare must come first. The Church is not opposed to free enterprise (nor to certain social reforms which have sometimes been labeled socialistic) but it is opposed to the excessive massing of private wealth. It condemns the kind of capitalism which ignores the social responsibilities and obligations of ownership. It is, therefore, against the unrestrained growth of big business, or monopoly capitalism.

While the economic system in America is difficult of precise definition, it is surely not 19th-century economic liberalism or *laissez faire* capitalism. It is not, of course, free of the evils which the Church has assailed. But there is no unrestricted right to the use, or abuse, of private property in this country. Quite the contrary; the rights of capitalists and corporations have been circumscribed severely by law in many ways. Owners of the means of production are restricted drastically by the Government, by trade unions, by numerous other agencies. They are compelled willy-

nily to have decent regard for the common good. Excessive individualism is curbed effectively. Social reforms, especially during the past two decades, have transformed the American economy so greatly that, according to the Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, S.J., writing in *America* for Dec. 2, 1950, it cannot be termed the kind of *laissez faire* capitalism that the Church has denounced. It does not conform to the classic definition of capitalism.

SERVE AS GUIDES

Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor in the United States Government, stated on May 6th at a special anniversary celebration in Brooklyn: "These encyclicals serve as the guides within which we must make our own individual and political decisions" on labor relations and social problems. He denied emphatically that the Church seeks to "dictate to the people what their beliefs should be on non-religious matters." He pointed out that among devout Catholics there is the same difference of opinion on non-religious issues as in other groups. But they all insist that "economic and political problems must be decided within the bounds of morality."

Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, and a devout Catholic, said:

The great emphasis of the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and of Pope Pius XI

on labor and the social order was on human rights, the dignity of the human soul and social justice. These are the ideals of the American labor movement, indeed of free trade unionists everywhere, regardless of their religious affiliations.

The American labor movement is non-sectarian, non-partisan and interracial, embracing in its ranks Catholics, Protestants and Jews. We believe in the traditional policy of organizing workers primarily along economic lines, rather than those of any one religion or of any political ideology. Our common interest in the welfare of workers, and in ethical principles, is what unites us. We urge the solidarity of all free workers who have faith in freedom, in the principles of human decency, the rights of man, the dignity of the individual, in the fight to abolish social injustice, poverty and the other evils upon which Communism thrives.

The ethics of Christianity are a negation of those of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, their complete opposite. The atheism, materialism and amorality of the Communists constitute an unbridgeable gulf between the slave world and the free world.

David J. McDonald, secretary-treasurer of the United Steelworkers of America, also a Catholic, added this comment:

In urging opposition to the evils both of excessive capitalism and atheistic Communism, Pope Pius XII did not make an equation of them. Far from it. He gave no comfort to those who would evade responsibility by saying that in the conflict between American "capitalism" and Russian Communism Christians should remain neutral. The papacy has condemned that attitude. Nowhere in the so-called capitalist world

is there such merciless persecution of religions as prevails in Communist countries. Capitalism at its worst cannot match the evils of Communism—slave labor, for example.

The Reverend Raymond McGowan, director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, was recently presented in New York with the fourth annual *Quadragesimo Anno Award* of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. On this occasion he observed that "trade unionism is of essential importance as a means of implementing the Christian principles of Social Justice." He urged unions to cooperate with the government and with other organizations in this great task. Essential to their success, he added, is the defeat of the ideology and the imperialism of atheistic Communism.

LABOR'S MAGNA CARTA

Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, called *Rerum Novarum* "a flash of light," and said:

It is the Magna Carta of labor's rights. Pope Pius XI told us that the welfare of the citizen, particularly the poor and the workers, was the just concern of the State. The calm guidance of the Church in these social matters has assisted seekers after peace and truth, not only of the Catholic faith but of every religious belief.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, who is a Protestant, also hailed these en-

cyclicals as giving inspiration to all workers. Mr. Green said:

The solidarity of labor dedicated to free trade unionism and democracy, regardless of the national origin and faith of the individual worker, is a mighty hope for the future of freedom of conscience, human decency, liberty, social justice and peace.

The credo of American Catholic labor leaders has been stated in the *Labor Leader*, organ of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, in these words:

Catholics should work with all men of

good will for the common goal of a sound social order—full and fair employment; guaranteed annual wages; fair prices; fair profits; recognition of labor as a partner in production, in management, in profits and ownership where possible; economic democracy through a system of industry councils giving labor a real voice in its economic destiny; private property distributed as widely as possible; public ownership of utilities and monopolies where necessary to protect the public interest; and, above all, social justice.

That is substantially the credo of all American trade unionists, regardless of race, color or religious belief.



Morality and Economics

It is only the moral law which, just as it commands us to seek our supreme and last end in the whole scheme of our activity, so likewise commands us to seek directly in each kind of activity those purposes which we know that nature, or rather God the Author of nature, established for that kind of action, and in orderly relationship to subordinate such immediate purposes to our supreme and last end. If we faithfully observe this law, then it will follow that the particular purposes, both individual and social, that are sought in the economic field will fall in their proper place in the universal order of purposes, and We, in ascending through them, as it were by steps, shall attain the final end of all things, that is God, to Himself and to us, the supreme and inexhaustible Good.—*Quadragesimo Anno*. N. 43.



Social Justice

Social justice cannot be said to have been satisfied so long as workingmen are denied a salary that will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and for their families; so long as they are denied the opportunity of acquiring a modest fortune and forestalling the plague of universal pauperism; so long as they cannot make suitable provision through public or private insurance for old age, for periods of illness and unemployment.—*On Atheistic Communism*, N. 52.

Liturgy and Life

DENNIS J. GEANEY, O.S.A.

Reprinted from ORATE FRATRES*

ON THE twenty-fifth anniversary of *Orate Fratres* I am asking myself this question: Is the liturgical movement in this country realistically coming to grips with the problems facing the world and the Church? Is it more concerned with the perfection of its ceremonies than with the struggle of the masses for justice? Is it more concerned with pious groups who form a liturgical study club than with the many who live as practical atheists?

The late Cardinal Suhard in his pastoral, *Priests Among Men*, put these questions in the form of a dilemma. "Is it not sinful to reserve all one's energy for the handful of the faithful, to devote one's life to a privileged minority when there is such a growing multitude of unbelievers? Should not Vespers, religious processions, devotions and, even more, the administrative affairs of the parish, give way to the ministry of preaching? The question at a deeper level is: Which has precedence, the sacramental celebrations or the spreading of the Gospel?" He answers the questions by saying "that

these two functions are not mutually exclusive but complementary."

My suspicion is that as Catholics, which includes liturgists, we lack an integrated vision of Christ's redeeming work. We see it too much as a sacristy affair, something removed from the monotony of the assembly line, the smoke-filled room of politics, the difficulty of family life in one room. We talk much about the integration of liturgy and life, but do we understand what life is in the practical order? Unless we are sharing in some degree the real life about us, we shall fail to bring this life to the altar.

Recently I visited the worst slum in the city. The area is called "The Rock." What was formerly a coal bin of a foundry was converted by thin partitions into a long row of blockhouses. Each hovel has one room, one door, one window and no plumbing. Oil stoves heat the rooms. Two tumbledown outhouses serve over one hundred people. In these 10x12 rooms live families with children. It does not take a sociologist to point out the moral effects on a

* St. John's Abbey, Collegeville Minn., January, 1951.

family living under these conditions. Such conditions have been known to result in brother and sister being parents of a child. The owner of the property expressed surprise at seeing a priest in the area. "Isn't this a little rough for you here?" he asked.

HUMAN NEEDS

The priest's problem here is not one of using missals at Mass, weekly Communion, or even baptism. Some of the basic requirements to live a human life are first needed. It is but little good to absolve the prostitute and send her back to the brothel. She must be absolved and the brothel destroyed. In the case in point housing and baptism go together. Decent houses must be built and baptism administered. I think that is what Cardinal Suhard meant by saying that the sacramental celebrations and the spreading of the Gospel are complementary. How can we be tolerant of the liturgist who is not restless to destroy the infernal ghettos that exist in his city?

In our higher income parishes we find Catholics who are responsible for "The Rock." We find in them members of the Chamber of Commerce which has opposed using Federal money for housing the poor. We find Catholic members of the Real Estate Board, which fights low income housing and rent controls. The Catholics who are not members of the Chamber of Commerce or the

Real Estate Board give approval of these actions by their almost total unconcern. Strangely enough the most militant champion of the poor and the feared enemy of the local Chamber of Commerce is a lapsed Catholic.

In another city near-race riots, calling out hundreds of policemen for a twenty-four hour detail, resulting from colored families moving into a neighborhood, or the rumor of one moving in, took place in localities heavily populated with Catholics. In one of these places the number of communicants at the Masses is astounding.

My question to liturgists is this? Would Catholics who go to Holy Communion once a month and throw rocks in race riots and protect their neighborhoods from "undesirables" change their ways of life if they went to Holy Communion every Sunday? Would Catholic anti-union employers cease their union-busting activities if they learned the *Missa de Angelis* and never missed a neum on Sunday?

We must realize that these people see no wrong in what they are doing. The few that do are caught in the web of social pressures. The leaders are crusaders against a vague thing they call Socialism, which they say is worse than Communism because it is more insidious. The implication is that even well-meaning priests are seduced. So every time they throw a block at low-income Federal housing,

or impede the natural right of man to organize, they somehow rationalize that they are advancing the Kingdom of God. We have little doubt that in confessing their sins they are exact in the number of times they miss their morning and evening prayers and are sincere in their contrition for these omissions. More frequent Communion might give them the occasion for being more righteous, like the Pharisee who prayed long prayers, fasted and gave tithes of all he possessed.

THE CHRISTIAN SOLUTION

Certainly the answer is not to cease urging more frequent Communion and communal worship. However, something else is needed to remove the obstacles to the free flowing of grace. "The ministry of preaching" means more than just preaching. And it certainly does not mean any kind of preaching. The Gospel must be preached against the background and problems of our day. Our social problems must be analyzed in the pulpit and the Christian solution found in the doctrine of the Mystical Body. We must preach Christ deprived of His right to organize, to live where He wishes, His right to a home, to the education of His family. In other words we preach Christ naked in the sense that He is stripped of His dignity as a man, stripped of the things closer to Him than His clothing. We must talk so plainly that there might be howls of protest from our best

contributors and even a letter to the bishop. We must be as firm on Catholic social principles as we are on the indissolubility of marriage and birth control. It is much easier to preach a crusade of prayer against Communism in Asia. "The drains smell badly; let us have a day of prayer about it." Pius XII warns us to avoid deciding on matters to be taught according to the pleasure of others "lest today as in the time of Isaias the Prophet it be repeated that 'you speak things which are pleasing to us'."

These sermons on the social problems must be liturgical sermons. After exploding the problem of segregation, for example, we must show how the Mass makes us one in Christ with all races and how Holy Communion gives the power to live this oneness in everyday life. Sermons by priests interested in the liturgical movement loaded with this kind of Christian dynamite would disabuse any critic of the liturgical movement who thinks it a fraternity of ecclesiastical diletantes.

When we descend from the pulpit after this type of sermon, the job is not done. The preaching would have the effect of dropping block busters out of bombers to open up the way for the foot soldiers. The infantry must follow up or the place is never taken. The neighborhood must become more than a place where there is sufficient and unsegregated housing

with inside plumbing. Our aim must be a Christian community.

People have to achieve this oneness outside of Mass as well as at Mass. It is naive to think that an hour a week in a church, even in a church where the liturgy is as intelligible as mysteries can be, most sacred and with the maximum participation, is going to transform the worshipers from a group of individualists in daily life to a Christian community in which their daily commerce is expressed in love for one another. They likely will remain isolated people who long for Sunday to get that communal feeling.

In *Mission to the Poorest*, Père Loew writes of his experience in a poor parish:

Although we were able to rouse more interest in the communal aspect of Sunday Mass, we saw clearly that this would result in little more than a merely *liturgical* Christian community—an hour a week was too short, and there were too many rooted habits to overcome. So we did all we could to encourage the evening meetings in which an average of thirty to forty Christians—married folk, young men and girls—chatted together for some three hours about their apostolic efforts and their Faith, ending at 11:30 P.M. with Mass—the culmination of their union with Christ and with each other.

In this country we cannot have evening Mass, but the meetings must be held just the same. In poor districts the people must meet to solve the problems of housing, race, mar-

riage, unions, work, education and so forth. When these discussions are interwoven with the Gospel text, what a tremendous preparation it would be for Mass or the continuation of Mass in daily life! Such meetings and such living should attract non-Catholics to the Church as did the martyrdoms of the early Church.

GROUP ACTION

In neighborhoods that are in the higher economic brackets, we find a higher percentage of Catholics going to Sunday Mass, a higher percentage going to Holy Communion, but community is just as far or farther removed. Poverty has the tendency to unite us; riches to divide us. Neighborhoods or parishes in the higher income brackets need desperately this community of thought and action to fulfill the command that we love one another and prepare us to worship as members of a Body. The doctor, the lawyer, the banker, the officer of the National Association of Manufacturers must bring to the altar a gift that befits a Christian—not just a week of any kind of work or a week's salary, but a week of intelligent Christian dedication to others. For many it would demand a complete reorientation of life.

How can this group action be achieved? It seems that the natural groupings of the parish should be kept. They are the working boys and working girls, the students and adult

groups meeting on the basis of common occupation or family or both. Each group has special problems and a particular sphere of influence. The workers cannot stop at promoting the block rosary or getting fallen-away Catholics back. They must Christianize work itself. One of the first steps may be to see that every workingman in the parish belongs to a union so that the Industry Council plan of Pius XI may be realized more easily. The lawyers of the parish cannot be satisfied with collecting for Christmas baskets or getting spiritual direction. They must be working week by week at making the legal profession serve individuals and society. They must Christianize law as an institution.

Besides organization on a parish level there must be federation with other parishes at diocesan and national levels in order to create an impact. No parish is an island. The laity must not become clerical assistants, but must assume their rightful place as confirmed Christians in solving the specific problems for which they are solely responsible. Upon the priest alone devolves the *inspiration* of a militant Christian laity.

We have the beginnings of such an apostolic movement in this country.

It might be hard for the observer to find, but the seeds are planted and are germinating under the earth. All groups are not organized on the basis indicated above, nor is it possible or necessary for all to fit into these categories. We have Friendship Houses, Catholic Worker groups, Young Christian Students, and many others on a non-parochial level. We have the Young Christian Workers and the Christian Family Movement with the parish as the basic unit. It must be said in deference to the pioneers in this work in this country that they had a cosmic view of things, with Christ and His redeeming work, the liturgy, in proper focus. It was never the Mass first and the YCW second, or the YCW first and the Mass second.

These distinctions of priorities departmentalize Christianity. Christ's redeeming work touches man's whole life, his work and worship. It is all of a piece. Even before many of these liturgically orientated movements took on American flesh and blood, the late Dom Virgil Michel, first editor of *Orate Fratres*, realized that the liturgy and social problems belonged together and he had the genius of keeping them together. May he rest in peace! Long live his spirit in *Orate Fratres!*



Assuredly, since social good must be of such a character that men through its acquisition are made better, it must necessarily be founded chiefly on virtue.—*Rerum Novarum*, N. 50.

Social Economics of Pope Pius XII

JOHN F. CRONIN, S.S.

*Reprinted from the SIGN**

I. The Evil of Our Time

POWER, naked and unrestricted—that is the evil of our time. These are *not* the words of Pope Pius XII. But this is the theme which runs through the countless messages of this tireless pontiff. He sees man, the individual man with his human dignity and God-given aspirations, threatened by giant concentrations of power.

At times this power may be political. Even as Cardinal Pacelli, he witnessed the ominous rise of the total state. He has seen devastating war, capped by the release of elemental atomic forces. At other times, this power is economic. Here again the state may be involved through unwise experiments at nationalization and socialization. Or it may be the power of capital, entrenched in its giant concentrations. It could be the strength of labor seeking gains at the ultimate expense of those it represents.

In the Christmas message of 1941, the pontiff saw the human spirit overwhelmed in confusion. Having turned from God, it is striving relentlessly for material success, seeking more and more, moving faster and faster:

These very symptoms appear in politics in the unlimited demand for expansion and political influence without regard for moral standards. In economic life they are represented by the predominance of mammoth concerns and trusts. In the social sphere it is the agglomeration of huge populations in cities and in the districts dominated by industry and trade, an agglomeration that is accompanied by the complete uprooting of the masses, who have lost their way of life, their homes, trades, friendships. By this new conception of thought and life, all ideas of social life have been impregnated with a purely mechanico-materialistic character.

The result is inevitable. The only unifying force in such circumstances is outward compulsion and domination founded upon power. Society is no longer based upon the dignity of the human personality, with men working together in terms of law, justice and charity. Force is the key principle, exercised by "the economic tyranny of an anonymous agglomeration of private capital and by the preponderance of the organized masses, ready to use their power to the detriment of justice and the rights of others" (March 11, 1945). This in contrast to the Christian ideal, where-

*Union City, N. J., Dec., 1950; Jan., 1951; Feb., 1951

by "The economy remains in the service of man, of his freedom and Christian dignity, at the same time that it serves the common good." (July, 1949)

A JUST WAGE FOR THE WORKER'S NEEDS

The Christmas broadcast of 1942 outlines the right path. "The origin and primary scope of social life is the conservation, development and perfection of the human person, helping him to realize accurately the demands and values of religion and culture set by the Creator for every man and for all mankind . . ." Concretely, this means "a just wage which covers the needs of the worker and his family." More than that, it calls for the "conservation and protection of a social order which will make possible an assured, if modest, private property for all classes of society." In such an order talented children, even of the poorer classes, will receive higher education. A social spirit will pervade every level of society, from neighborhood to nation. And the worker will no longer be isolated in an inferior class, but will feel a human and Christian solidarity with all his fellows in every walk of life.

Mere national wealth alone will not suffice to bring this about. It is possible to pile up riches at the expense of the human spirit. Socialism and Communism promise material abundance, but at a sacrifice too cruel

to contemplate. An economy of abundance is an attractive phrase, but it is desirable only when "such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the personal development of its members." (May 15, 1941)

Such, in very broad outlines, is the social teaching of the present Holy Father. At first glance, the theme of these articles is open to misunderstanding. It could not be that the moral teaching of one pope should differ from that of his predecessors. The principles of revelation and natural law do not change. But historical conditions do change, sometimes violently. The evils of one day may be a violent reaction to the evils of another. Thus, in the 19th century, the State stood by impotently when workers were exploited. Today, too often, the State itself is the exploiter.

Confronted with the do-nothing state of the nineteenth century, Pope Leo XIII called for social legislation as well as labor organization. These would protect the exploited and counter the allure of Socialism. Much progress was made in the forty years following *Rerum Novarum*, but it could not be said that Christian principles were yet enmeshed in the structure of society. Pope Pius XI could see fearful abuses in twentieth-century capitalism as well as in the rise of Communist power. He called for a

social order based on co-operation by all for the common good.

With the advent of the present Holy Father, still another picture confronted the world. The depression of the 1930's had brought great reforms in its wake. At the same time it was in part an excuse for the growth of the total state. There was progress and many improvements, but men were often less free than were their grandfathers. In correcting one evil, we had too often gone to the opposite and equally wrong extreme. Naturally, then, there is a distinctly different emphasis in the social teaching of the present pope.

It is the task of the Church to weigh the society of each generation in terms of its influence upon man's salvation:

Upon the form given to society, whether conforming or not to the divine law, depends and emerges the good or ill of souls, depends the decision whether men, all called to be revived by the grace of Christ, do actually in the detailed course of their life breathe the healthy, vivifying atmosphere of truth and moral virtue or the disease-laden and often fatal air of error and corruption. Before such a thought and such an anticipation, how could the Church, loving Mother that she is, solicitous for the welfare of her children, remain an indifferent onlooker in their danger, remain silent or feign not to see or take cognizance of social conditions which, whether one wills it or not, make difficult or practically impossible a Christian life?" (May 15, 1941).

It is no wonder, then, that the Pope

told the College of Cardinals on June 2, 1947 that the Church has a social doctrine from which no true Christian may deviate. It teaches moral principles based on the dignity of man and the true nature of society. Such principles are not incompatible with sound economic laws. The old statement of the philosophers that the true, the good and the beautiful are deeply related is equally applicable today. "There can be no incompatibility between a realism, healthfully nourished by facts, statistics and economic laws and a social order quite legitimately imbued with aspiration for more justice and humanity. These two aspects of the same problem are complementary . . ." (July, 1949)

DENIAL OF MORALITY

The first major encyclical of the present Holy Father, *Summi Pontificatus*, noted that the basic cause of modern evils is the denial of morality, the natural law and God Himself. There is a spiritual crisis in the world today. "The re-education of mankind, if it is to have any effect, must be above all things spiritual and religious. Hence it must proceed from Christ as its indispensable foundation, must be actuated by justice and crowned by charity."

Pope Pius XII entered his pontificate in an atmosphere of crisis. Six months after his election, he was to see the unleashing of the Second World War. In spite of every Papal

attempt to secure peace with justice, the war was to run its course. Ultimately the evil of totalitarian Nazism was to be destroyed, but the price was high. Europe was in ruins. To the East, there loomed the even more dangerous specter of world Communism. The war was ended, but peace did not return upon the earth.

After the war, the world faced its problem of reconstruction. There was the immediate problem of feeding the hungry and of warding off the inroads of Communism. Next came the no less urgent duty of political and economic revival. In politics, Western Europe chose the democratic way in spite of extremists of right and left. The trend in economics was more confused, ranging from Socialist experiments to a revival of capitalism in one form or other. Difficult decisions had to be made. There was always the danger that short-term considerations would obscure sound principles.

In these trying years Catholics naturally turned to the Holy See for guidance. Particularly they were concerned with the structure of economic society. After the war many European Catholics concluded that capitalism had failed. It did not give the worker the material basis for a life of Christian dignity. The insecurity engendered by depressions, the fearful burdens of poverty and unemployment, all these seemed to indicate that a new social order was ur-

gently needed. Indeed, unless some suitable substitute for capitalism were found, how could they keep the mass of workers from the allures of Communism?

SOCIAL TEACHING DISTORTED

One of their first reactions was to favor nationalization of business. Many Catholic thinkers quoted Pope Pius XI to the effect that the State had a right to take over enterprises in the interests of the common good. Moreover, such a program would steal the thunder from the Socialists and attract workers impressed by Communist propaganda. But these Catholics had, in fact, distorted the social teaching of the Church. Nationalization of private business is permissible under certain limited and exceptional conditions. It is not to be the guiding principle of social reform. The Holy Father made this clear upon at least five occasions during the period 1946-1949.

Social-minded Catholics then tried a new approach to basic reform. If nationalization would increase the already excessive concentration of power in economic life, perhaps the answer was to be found in worker participation in private enterprise.

Some writers concluded that the dignity of labor implies a right to partnership in the firm. The contribution of workers to an enterprise is equally as important as that of capital. Hence they have a right to

participate in the economic decisions of management.

Again Rome had to intervene. It was true that Pope Pius XI advocated, in cautious and qualified terms, experiments in labor-management partnership. Moreover, co-operation between economic groups has been a keystone in Catholic social thought. But the approach of many social reformers savored too much of co-operation at the point of a gun. What is more, the alleged *right* to partnership conflicts with the deep and fundamental right to private property. The Pope conveyed this thought delicately in May, 1949. When some Catholics still misunderstood him, he made himself bluntly clear in his address of June 3, 1950.

FIELDS OF COOPERATION

At the same time, the Holy Father gave some positive directions on fruitful fields of co-operation. He noted the grave problem of unemployment, which hovers like a nightmare over modern society. Co-operation to meet this issue could bring about a productive union of capital and labor. It could be a step toward a social order based on collaboration of all in the interests of the common good.

Too many postwar Catholic thinkers overlooked the unified and organic nature of the Catholic social program. They emphasized isolated features to such an extent that they distorted the picture. The society they

would create would lack balance. They forgot that certain policies, carried to an extreme, could lead only to disaster.

Even sound movements advocated by the popes, such as social legislation and organization of labor, must be considered in terms of the over-all picture. They are means to achieve the workers' rights. They should not be pushed to the point where they lead to power concentrations which enslave the worker.

These points illustrate the methods used by the present Holy Father in presenting his social teaching. He makes it clear that the social encyclicals of his predecessors, particularly *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pope Pius XI, should be the guides of social Catholics. He has commented upon these teachings in about fifty important broadcasts, allocutions, addresses and letters. Thus far, he has not issued a major social encyclical of his own.

Nevertheless, the ensemble of statements are of the highest value in interpreting the teachings of his predecessors. He has cleared up many doubtful points. In pointing out errors, such as those involving nationalization, he has changed the course of postwar Europe. His inspired analysis of trends and problems of our day has brought to life principles which hitherto remained abstract and unappreciated. Hence, in a real sense he has developed a major social pro-

gram to cope with the problems of the postwar world.

Perhaps the simplest guide to Papal remedies for the modern world is found in the word which opened this article: power. With excessive concentration of power the cardinal evil of the day, we have at least a negative touchstone of social policy. If a program of reform tends to submerge the individual in one or other giant power group, it would be well to look for a better method of reform.

Thus, in international life we should avoid the "unlimited demand for expansion and influence without regard to moral standards." When that phrase was written, in Christmas 1941, it applied particularly to Hitlerism. Today it portrays the movement of world Communism. But it should also warn us, in our struggle against Soviet expansion, of the price paid when expediency is placed above principle.

In the domestic economy of nations, we saw the apotheosis of power in the total states of Hitler, Stalin and their lesser imitators. Here the individual is at the mercy of the ruling class. This crime against God and man has been condemned too often by the Holy Father to need repetition here. But the Pope also warned democratic governments against undue interference with their citizens.

This is especially true in the matter of nationalizing private business. Socialization is likely to make eco-

nomic life more rather than less mechanical. (July 10, 1946) "... the working class is faced with the danger of being a slave to the public authority." (January 25, 1946) "But to make of this State enterprise the normal rule for public economic organization would mean reversing the order of things. Actually it is the mission of public law to serve private rights, not to absorb them." (May 7, 1949)

POWER IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Excessive concentration of power is likewise possible in private industry. The Pope has referred unfavorably to the "predominance of mammoth concerns and trusts." (Christmas, 1941) He regrets "The concentration of enterprise and the disappearance of small independent producers." (July 10, 1946) Indeed, "the Church wishes to impose a definite limit to the subordination of man to the machine. Small craftsmen as a class may be regarded as a militia chosen to defend the personal dignity and character of the worker. For more than a century, they have had to fight for their existence against great industrial enterprises." (October 20, 1947)

At times the Holy Father uses the term "capitalism" to denote such excessive concentrations of power and, as such, condemns it. This was especially true in his radio address of September 1, 1944 and his address

on women's duties, October 21, 1945. It must be noted, however, that such condemnation is not a rejection of private enterprise. On the contrary, "capitalism" as defined is denounced precisely because it makes widespread ownership and real private enterprise impossible.

It was in this context that the Pope made some recent reference to labor unions, references which puzzled many here. He spoke of unions as "a spontaneous and necessary consequence of capitalism embodied in an economic system." (September 11,

1949) A week before he called them "organizations of self-defense" made necessary by defects in the economic system and the lack of a Christian mentality. Here, too, is concentration of power, unavoidable in present circumstances, but nonetheless a source of possible danger.

Such is the great evil of our time: excessive power in the hands of a few. But the Holy Father was not content merely to condemn, he offered a solution. The first step in the diffusion of power is diffusion of property.

II. Private Property

The present Holy Father may well be called "the pope of private property." Certainly the diffusion of property ownership is a cardinal point in his social teaching. It is true that, years before, Pope Leo XIII defended the right of ownership against the Socialists. But in *Rerum Novarum* the emphasis was upon possession as the basis for family security. Forty years later, Pope Pius XI deplored the injustice involved in unequal distribution of wealth. But today the stress is upon property as the basis for human freedom.

This is not a new idea. St. Thomas Aquinas once distinguished the free man from the slave mainly because the former owns property. He noted that slaves "do not have the ability of resisting the rule of the master,

because they own nothing of their own." But free men, although subject to authority, "have something which they own, from which they may resist the command of a ruler."

The same notion was embodied in the early forms of American democracy. It was not unusual for the right to vote to be restricted to property owners. The theory was that owners would be independent, responsible citizens. Those who were economically dependent upon others might not be able to vote freely. Even though we have abandoned these restrictions upon the suffrage, many still living can remember how workers in company towns were told how to vote.

Pope Pius XII bases the right to actual ownership upon the dignity of

man. In his Christmas broadcast of 1942, he stated: "The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally, as a natural foundation of life, the right to use the goods of the earth. To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all.

DIGNITY OF MAN

"Positive legislation regulating private ownership may change and more or less restrict its use. But if legislation is to play its part in the pacification of the community, it must prevent the worker, who is or will be the father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person."

In a later address, September 1, 1944, the Pope notes that property aids "not only economic freedom, but political, cultural and religious freedom as well." It "provides man with a secure material basis of the highest import, on which to rise to the fulfillment, with reasonable liberty, of his moral duties. The safe guardianship of this right [to the use of material goods] will ensure the personal dignity of man . . ." (May 15, 1941)

Man might achieve security under Socialism or some other form of statism, but he would have no protection for his personal freedom, no economic basis for his human dig-

nity. "Only those who deny to men the dignity of free persons can admit the possibility of substituting for the right of private property (and consequently the very institution of private property) some system of insurance and protection by public law." (May 20, 1948)

The Holy Father argues that the right of man to own material goods is even more fundamental than the institution of private property, which is the most natural method for implementing the former right. Accordingly, when private ownership is so perverted as to prevent widespread distribution of the world's goods, it is undermining the very foundations of private property. The right to use the goods of the earth is a "first and fundamental right." (May 15, 1941)

In contrast to the attitude of certain Catholics, the Pope does not hesitate to stress the economic basis of human freedom. Men must first eat before they are able to vote, to write literature or even to pray. This may seem to be using crude and inexact language for the Pontiff's ideas. But the history of the total state, Nazi or Communist, shows what control over economic life can achieve. If man depends upon the State for his food, he is a slave of the State. Where his dependence is upon concentrated power, whether of capital of labor, he is subject to that power.

But when millions have property as the basis for their subsistence, they

are free. Even if other millions must work for wages, they have freedom to move about from job to job. They can organize into unions for their own protection. Moreover, these unions, paralleling the structure of industry, are sufficiently small to be effective democracies.

PRODUCTIVE PROPERTY

A careful reading of the Pope's language makes it clear that the property he wishes distributed is mainly *productive* property. He wants something from which a man can gain his living. This could mean a farm, a gasoline filling station, a small factory or a store. Wealth for consumption should likewise be distributed, but this of itself does not confer freedom. A Socialist or Communist state could pass out sufficient food, clothing, housing and other necessities and luxuries. But men would still be dependent upon a central power for the means to live.

In the United States today one is considered a bit unorthodox if one attacks bigness as such. One might even be accused of being in the secret employ of the antitrust division of the Department of Justice. Attacks on bigness are "penalizing success." But the Holy Father did not hesitate to attack "mammoth concerns and trusts," "concentration of large enterprises," and the prevalence of big business.

Details on this point come up later,

but the general argument is clear: Bigness produces an unhealthy form of society. Corporation executives may enjoy huge salaries. They may live in luxury, with two cars, Florida vacations and other perquisites of modern nobility. But they are not economically free. They take their orders from higher executives, boards of directors or controlling financial groups.

Likewise bigness as it appears in certain large cities destroys the social life of the neighborhood. People form masses, not an organically related series of societies. When any group becomes too big, whether it be an industrial firm, a labor union or a division of government, the element of personal control by the members is bound to disappear. It is physically impossible for 100,000 scattered stockholders effectively to control an enterprise. A labor union of the same size faces equal difficulties, unless power is adequately diffused in the locals or even smaller subdivisions.

It is obvious, then, that if freedom is to be based on property ownership, this property in turn must be widely distributed. Hence the Pope advises labor "not to abolish private property, the foundation of family stability, but to work for its extension." (June 13, 1943) To men devoted to Catholic Action, he states: "What you can and ought to strive for is a more just distribution of

wealth . . . the Church is opposed to the accumulation of these goods in the hands of a relatively small and exceedingly rich group, while vast masses of people are condemned to pauperism and an economic condition unworthy of human beings." (September 7, 1947)

In this way the Church aims "at securing that the institution of private property be such as it should be according to the designs of God's wisdom and the disposition of nature; an element of social order, a necessary presupposition to human initiative, an incentive to work to the advantage of life's purpose here and hereafter, and hence of the liberty and dignity of man, created in the likeness of God, who from the beginning assigned him for his benefit domination over material things." (September 1, 1944)

LIVING SPACE

To secure freedom based on property ownership rather than dependence upon giant groups, social policy must favor distribution of wealth along many lines. There must be living space for nations. There should be every encouragement for small and medium-sized business. Wage earners should become property owners. Finally, the farmer should be protected in his vital vocation. Each of these points recurs in Papal messages.

The phrase "living space" has

more than accidental similarity to Hitler's *Lebensraum*. The Pope wished to point out a correct method of securing necessary land, in contrast to the military expeditions of the Nazis. That some nations need more space for surplus population, he readily concedes. But the right method is orderly emigration to the great unused land spaces of the earth. He asks for "the more favorable distribution of men on the earth's surface suitable to colonies of agricultural workers; that surface which God created and prepared for the use of all." (May 15, 1941) Such migrations will benefit both the country which gives its sons and the nation which is enriched by their industry.

More than this, there must be access to raw materials so that nations less richly endowed may have a chance to survive. "Within the limits of a new order founded on moral principles there is no place for that cold and calculating egoism which tends to hoard economic resources and materials destined for the use of all, to such an extent that the nations less favored by nature are not permitted access to them." (Christmas, 1941) A year later, the Pope asked for a "generous sharing of forces between the strong and the weak," in the interests of universal peace.

Clearly the right to private property does not mean the right to hoard resources selfishly in open disregard of the common good. If such an at-

titude were to prevail, desperate men would seize what they need. Hence, the Pope warns those who "so interpret and use the relationships of private property that they succeed—even better than their adversaries—in overthrowing this very institution, so natural and indispensable to human life, and especially to the family." (March 7, 1948) Unless a sound international juridical and economic order leads to the effective distribution of the world's wealth, we are bound to have strife and even war.

SMALL HOLDINGS

Within nations, also, wealth must be effectively distributed. We noted earlier the danger which comes from power concentrations inherent in big-business, whether it be economic, political or social. The remedy is clear. "Small and medium holdings in agriculture, in the arts and trades, in commerce and industry should be guaranteed and promoted; co-operative unions should ensure for them the advantages of big business; where big business even today shows itself more productive, there should be given the possibility of tempering the labor contract with the contract of co-ownership." (September 1, 1944)

The Pope rejects the notion that technical progress by its very nature calls for a managerial revolution, with private property vanishing in the face of giant economic groups. "Technical progress, as a social fac-

tor, should not prevail over the general good, but should rather be directed and subordinated to it." In itself it is an indifferent and flexible thing. In the past it has been too often used as a servant of greed; "why should it not then yield also to the necessity of maintaining and ensuring private property for all, that cornerstone of social order?"

There is here no implication that small businessmen are more socially minded than corporation executives. Actually in the United States a case could be made for the reverse thesis. It is not the abuse of power which is condemned, but the fact of its concentration. No matter how benevolent or socially minded is a large group, economic, political or social, it is structurally dangerous, because it necessarily erects a wall between the ruler and those governed.

Nor should it be necessary that economic efficiency suffer from a more socially desirable structure of industry. The Pope hints that co-operative action could give smaller firms the efficiency of their giant brothers. Such could be joint purchasing, sales, advertising, research, and similar activities. Where big business is an economic necessity, the possibility of labor-management partnership should be explored, so as to bridge the gap between worker and employer.

Moreover, the diffusion of property should also work in favor of the wage-earner. He should be able to save

so as to have property of his own as the foundation of family security. The Pope does not specify what type of ownership should be sought in the case of the worker. Undoubtedly in some cases he hopes that it will enable him to go into business for himself. This would bring about the increase in small and medium firms previously noted.

From other remarks, it seems evident that the Holy Father envisions the purchase of a home and some small area of land. Both of these conduce to family stability and to the proper rearing of children. With land and a home, even an industrial worker can achieve a relative independence. He does not depend completely upon his factory job for the two prime necessities of food and shelter. Furthermore, he has a more definite stake in his city and country and hence should become a more responsible citizen.

CO-OWNERSHIP

Finally, where the worker must be a laborer in a very large firm, some effort should be made to achieve a real society instead of a mass held together by external pressure. In the text cited above, the Pope asks here for "the possibility of tempering the labor contract with the contract of co-ownership." This is a reference to the passage of *Quadragesimo Anno*, reaffirmed on June 3, 1950, stating the desirability of modifying the

wage contract through some share in profits, management or ownership. Where large industry is necessary, this improvement on the wage contract would give workers some of the independence, security and sense of belonging which normally accrues from property ownership.

To complete the picture of diffused ownership, it is natural to turn to the farming community. The Papal message of November 15, 1946, to the Italian farmers shows a deep love for the farm and its influence upon mankind. The Pope says bluntly that there is a deep-seated difference between farm and city, "each viewpoint produces altogether different men." The farm is a citadel of independence based on private ownership. It is a shrine of nature, a natural home to the family.

It would be tragic were the farmer to succumb to the allures of urban capitalism and become a slave to the desire for gain, regardless of human needs. "If now the city dweller suffers from this unnatural state, how much more is it contrary to the intimate essence of the farmer's life." Even worse is the situation where outside pressures, usually of government, make the farmer a cog in a mass-production machine. Here the Pope is attacking primarily the forced collectivization in Communist lands, but he also has in mind social policy elsewhere which favors factory farming in contrast to the family farm.

Self-restraint is needed both in the rural and the urban communities. The farmer must not yield to the specious attractions of city luxury, to become merely another type of speculator in the world's markets. Nor should the city, in the desire for ever cheaper and more abundant goods, sacrifice the stability inherent in diffused ownership and force farmers into giant, collective groups.

In the light of what has been said, the outlines of a Papal social program begin to emerge. *Pope Pius XII wants the structure of economic society to be an inherent bulwark of freedom. This means diffusion of power through diffusion of ownership.* Other reforms are desirable, but if they are sought by faulty means, the great evils of modern life will still persist. Thus, it is necessary to secure a high level of national income, properly distributed, so as to make a living wage available for all. But if this is achieved by collectivist measures, men will still be unfree. They will be well paid serfs, either of the Socialist state or of giant combines of capital.

The same applies to social reform which relies exclusively upon social legislation or the ever-increasing

power of giant labor unions. Here we run into a boundary line where labor would repeat the mistakes of capital, through concentration of power. "A Socialist mentality would accommodate itself very easily to such a situation. But it would disturb the persons who grasp the fundamental importance of private property rights as a stimulus to production and the determining of responsibility in economic matters." (June 3, 1950)

Herein lies the great contribution of Pope Pius XII, in contrast to his illustrious predecessors. Pope Pius XI was inspired to envision a social order based on co-operation for the common good. His successor constantly repeated this idea, as will be noted in the article to follow, but he added his own major proposals. In a sense, Pope Pius XI concentrated upon the *functioning* of economic life, with important modifications of structure needed to achieve sound and harmonious action. The present Holy Father probed even deeper. He wishes the very *structure* of society to be a foundation for man's dignity and freedom.

How would such a society work?

III. Society and Freedom

Pope Pius XII wishes man's freedom to be guaranteed by the very structure of society. But a sound

structure is not enough; the social order must function according to justice and charity. Otherwise we

would be back in the eighteenth century, starting again the terrible abuses which followed the industrial revolution.

Freedom as a slogan is not new in the world. Our modern civilization in many ways is founded upon revolt. The Protestant Revolt in the 16th century was heralded as a blow for man's freedom. In the 17th and 18th centuries, business men demanded their liberty, this time from social controls. During the same period ancient customs and beliefs were overthrown. Yet many thoughtful historians would now argue that the wrong kind of freedom led directly to the dictator states of our century.

DISCIPLINED FREEDOM

This distinction is very important in understanding the social teaching of the present Holy Father. Diffused private property does lay the foundation for man's freedom. But this property in turn must be used for the common good and subject to necessary social controls. Otherwise, we would but repeat the mistakes of the 18th and 19th centuries. Hence, an ideal social order would embody freedom in its structure, but it would be a disciplined and socially directed freedom, not the anarchy of individualism.

Thus, in the international sphere, there would be a society of free nations, working together to found a

sound juridical order. Nations would enjoy real freedom. Military might or economic supremacy would not be permitted to give more powerful nations dictatorial functions. Colonial nations would be trained to attain ultimate independence. The world council of nations, whatever be its title at any time, would work out a body of law to govern the relations among states.

Trade among nations would likewise be subject to social controls, with two major ends in view. The first aim would be fair distribution of the world's wealth, with "have-not" nations given access to essential raw materials. Likewise there would be more equitable distribution of population, so that overcrowded nations could foster emigration in favor of underdeveloped areas. Thus, there would be equalizing of opportunity and lessening of the tensions which lead to strife among nations.

The second principle regarding world trade would be its subordination to sound domestic policy. Great harm was done in the past by an uncontrolled freedom of commerce, which left great nations helpless before the vagaries of world markets. This led to the opposite extreme of false nationalism, which used trade as a weapon of national power. The ideal is a middle way: free trade within the confines of social policy. This means that domestic security, full and stable employment at home,

and national living standards would be given first consideration. Subject to these safeguards, trade would be free.

DEMOCRACY PREFERRED

Within nations themselves, the preferable form of government would be political democracy. While the Church is neutral regarding forms of rule, so long as they are just, yet the power of the modern state is such that other forms of government could easily become tyrannical. "If then, we consider the extent and nature of the sacrifice demanded of all the citizens, especially in our day when the activity of the State is so vast and decisive, the democratic form of government appears to many as a postulate of nature imposed by reason itself." (Christmas Broadcast, 1944)

Government exists to serve its citizens. "The State and politics have, in fact, precisely the office of securing for the family of every social class conditions necessary for them to exist and to evolve as economic, juridical, and moral entities." (October 21, 1945) People would not be "merely objects, that is to say, deprived of all right and subject to exploitation by others, but all instead would be subjects, that is, having an intimate share in the formation of the social order . . . with sufficient means of support, protected effectively against the violence of an egoistic economy, in freedom defined by

the general welfare, and with full human dignity, each respecting his neighbor as he respects himself." (September 12, 1948)

The social policy of the State should be governed by the principles given in the magnificent passage just quoted. It should seek to make its citizens self-sufficient and self-supporting persons, and not to rule mechanically over mere masses held in economic subjection. Economic freedom, tempered by social responsibility, is the goal of sound politics. These points recur frequently in Papal addresses, but were stressed particularly in the Christmas Broadcast of 1942 and the Address to Italian Workers, June 13, 1943.

In detail, this means a policy of favoring small and medium-sized business and, in general, diffusion of property ownership. Where a large number of citizens are effective owners of wealth, a strong foundation for freedom exists. Property consisting of shares in giant firms is not effective ownership, since thousands of scattered stockholders find it impossible to exercise control over their corporations.

The practical methods for achieving diffused ownership naturally vary from country to country. The Pope specifies ends; he does not normally indicate the means for achieving them. In the United States, small business can be fostered by tax policies, by making investment money

more available to prospective owners, by favoring small firms in the immense purchasing activities of the Federal Government, and by making research, marketing and other facilities available to them.

Anti-trust programs could discourage bigness beyond the level of economic efficiency. Whether it would be fair to try to dismember existing corporate giants is a more controversial question. Some bigness is essential for certain forms of production. Until recently, at least, one could hardly have a small steel mill. The mass production of automobiles likewise demands a certain minimum size. Only large firms can afford continual and exhaustive research. But constant vigilance is needed to avoid bigness for the sake of power, rather than efficiency. If this policy is supplemented by vigorous encouragement of smaller firms, we will have diffused economic power.

Thus, we would have an economy characterized by the predominance of free business and professional men, industrialists and farmers. But this freedom would not be absolute; it must be subject to social control in the interests of the common good. Concern for the general welfare should, of course, be a matter of individual conscience. But it is also a question of social organization. The form of this organization is vital to the preservation of freedom. Social controls of the recent past, adminis-

tered almost exclusively by the State or by giant labor organizations, do not fit perfectly in the pattern of diffused power. Other methods should be found, if freedom is to be complete.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM UNDER THE WAGE CONTRACT

Even with diffusion of property, there would still be a labor problem. The needs of a large population demand some large-scale production and distribution facilities. Small and medium-sized companies will still employ workers. The problem, then, is to ensure economic freedom to men under the wage contract.

Great advances were made in this direction since Pope Leo XIII spoke in 1891. Labor has organized into unions for the purpose of protecting its rights. In addition, there has been remarkable progress in social legislation. Nevertheless, future gains should not necessarily be sought by simply further emphasizing the power of labor and the control of government in relation to the employer. Such a trend would be dangerous.

As already noted, it would increase power concentration in society. It might undermine the right of private property by virtually abolishing employers' control over their wealth. It could accentuate class warfare. By removing the necessary discipline in economic life, it could actually lower production and hence decrease liv-

ing standards. This trend could easily become a prelude to Socialism.

Because of these dangers, the Holy Father found it necessary several times to defend the basic rights of employers. He noted that "the Church does not promise that absolute equality which others are claiming" because men naturally gravitate toward different positions in society. (October 31, 1948) "The owner of the means of production . . . must always, within the limits of public economic law, retain control of his economic decisions." (May 7, 1949) He may receive higher income than the workers. Nor may the workers claim as a *right* a position of partnership with management. "Neither the nature of the labor contract nor the nature of the business enterprise in themselves admit necessarily of a right of this sort." (June 3, 1950)

This does not mean that the Pope opposes attempts at labor-management partnership. On the contrary, he explicitly commends them in the same address. But he believes that the path to co-operation is education and persuasion, not economic or moral force. Neither pressure by unions or the State, nor the assertion of an alleged right, could drag employers into a fruitful partnership.

The only lasting answer is the form of social organization proposed by Pope Pius XI, in May, 1931. This proposal has been called by Catho-

lics here the Industry-Council System. It is particularly worthwhile to note the arguments used by the present Holy Father in advancing this position.

He notes that "over and above the distinction between employer and employe, which threatens more seriously every day to become a pitiless separation, there is human labor itself: the work to be done, the job to which every man contributes something vital and personal, with a view to supplying society with goods and services adequate to its needs. It lies in the very nature of labor, understood in this sense, to draw men together in a genuine and intimate union, and to restore form and structure to a society which has become shapeless and unstable." (July 18, 1947)

WORKING TOGETHER

Earlier he stated that "the time has come to repudiate empty phrases, and to attempt to organize the forces of the people on a new basis; to raise them above the distinction between employers and would-be workers, and to realize the higher unity which is a bond between all those who co-operate in production, formed by their solidarity in the duty of working together for the common good and filling together the needs of the community.

"If this solidarity is extended to all the branches of production, if it

becomes the foundation for a better economic system, it will lead the working class to obtain honestly their share of responsibility in the direction of the national economy. Thus, thanks to such harmonious co-ordination and co-operation; thanks to this closer unity of labor with the other elements of economic life, the worker will receive as a result of his activity sufficient to meet his needs and those of his family, with spiritual satisfaction and a powerful incentive toward self-improvement." (March 11, 1945)

Clearly then, the task is to remove the prejudice that labor and capital are involved in "an irreducible clash of rival interests," whereas actually they are "linked in a community of action and interest. . . . They are co-operators in a common task. They eat, so to speak, from the same table. . . ." (May 7, 1949) In the light of these statements, it seems clear that labor-management co-operation should be the first step toward a sound social order.

Theorists may disagree as to the full implications of the social order proposed by Pope Pius XI, but his successor leaves no doubt as to the immediate steps to be taken. If society is to be based on co-operation of free men for the common good, rather than on strife or an order externally imposed by power groups, the place to begin is with labor and management. When they collaborate

unselfishly, other reforms will follow rapidly.

The Pope does not consider such harmony an impossible ideal. On the contrary, he stresses the common interests which make any other course a matter of folly. They are partners in production. They share alike from general national prosperity. They suffer equally from "the problem of major importance and major urgency which broods like a nightmare especially over old industrial countries, that is, the imminent and permanent menace of unemployment." (June 3, 1950)

Social policy should aim at convincing employers and workers alike of their vital common concerns and at fostering in them the habit of co-operation. Two concrete approaches may be of interest to Catholic social leaders in the United States. The first is the development sometimes called "human relations in industry." The second is the series of studies entitled "Causes of Industrial Peace." From such studies of how harmony is actually achieved, we could derive principles for implementing the directions of the Holy Father.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Human relations programs are based primarily upon the idea that industry should bring workers into a limited partnership. This approach was suggested by studies, undertaken by psychologists and sociologists, into

the causes of dissatisfaction in industry. They found that the worker was not an "economic man," moved only by considerations of pay. At work as well as at home men have deep human feelings. If they are treated as machines, they are bound to be resentful, no matter how well they are paid.

Hence the worker should be treated with dignity and respect. This has many implications in practice. Thus, efforts should be made to fit a worker to a job suitable to his talents and training. He should be afforded opportunity for education and advanced training. Decisions should be explained to him, not handed down as "take it or leave it" orders. Generally he should be consulted in advance on matters affecting him. He should be made to feel a valuable and respected part of the firm. The worker in turn would then take to heart the interests of his company.

There are hundreds of publications and many periodicals devoted to explaining these basic ideas. Notable was a 1949 statement signed by seven corporation executives, with the advice of scores of business men, labor leaders, educators and clergymen, called *Human Relations in Modern Business*. Catholics would find its philosophy not foreign to that of the Popes. Would it be asking too much of us to study such proved approaches to co-operation in the plant community?

A second promising avenue is the series of case studies made by the National Planning Association, under the heading "Causes of Industrial Peace." Here fifteen outstanding instances of labor-management harmony are studied in detail, with every effort made to learn the reasons for success. From both approaches, human relations and industrial peace, we could derive many sound and promising ideas. The one emphasizes what an enlightened employer can do, without by any means excluding the union from the partnership. The other emphasizes successful collective bargaining which has gradually approached the level of partnership.

COLLABORATION THE RULE

With this material we can convince the skeptical that moral principles do bring success in economic life. We can use the argument of example to persuade others to follow the same lines. Our aim would be to make collaboration between workers and management the rule rather than the exception. This would be an important first step toward a sound social order.

The other steps would then be less difficult. We would seek co-operation among business and professional men for their own mutual interests and the common welfare. We would strive for joint counsel and action among all economic groups to meet certain universal problems, such as

preventing depressions. These common-interest groups in turn could make and enforce such regulations as are needed to promote the general welfare. This would remove from the State its overwhelming burden of detailed social control, and thus lead to diffusion of power.

Once the common sense of co-operation had been proved in the difficult field of labor-management relations, it should be easier to promote it elsewhere. Thus, we would arrive at a social order with freedom a part of its structure, but with this freedom subject to social control in the in-

terests of all. Control would be scattered among small, self-regulating groups. Problems of national scope could be handled by larger councils. This would be real economic democracy, in contrast to the jungle law of individualism or the iron discipline of the suffocating, all-powerful police state.

Of old it was said that "the truth shall make you free." Our social teaching is based on truth; the truth of the Gospel, and truth founded on the nature of man. If only human society could realize and apply this truth, men would, indeed, be free.



Superfluous Income

A person's superfluous income, that is, income which he does not need to sustain life fittingly and with dignity, is not left wholly to his own free determination. Rather the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church constantly declare in the most explicit language that the rich are bound by a very grave precept to practice almsgiving, beneficence and munificence.

Expending larger incomes so that opportunity for gainful work may be abundant, provided, however, that this work is applied to producing really useful goods, ought to be considered, as We deduce from the principles of the Angelic Doctor, an outstanding exemplification of the virtue of munificence and one particularly suited to the needs of the times.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 50, 51.



Role of Parish Priests

Let our parish priests, therefore, while providing of course for the normal needs of the Faithful, dedicate the better part of their endeavors and their zeal to winning back the laboring masses to Christ and His Church.—*On Atheistic Communism*, N. 62.

Blessed Pius X: A Great Social Apostle

L. J. TWOMEY, S.J.

*Reprinted from CHRIST'S BLUEPRINT OF THE SOUTH**

JOSEPH MELCHIOR SARTO was born on June 2, 1835; he died on August 20, 1914. Thirty-six years, nine months and thirteen days later, on June 3, 1951, he was declared "Blessed" by Pius XII.

Joseph Sarto was ordained on September 18, 1858. He was appointed Bishop of Mantua by Leo XIII on November 10, 1884. He became the Cardinal-Archbishop of Venice on June 12, 1893. On August 4, 1903, he was elected Pope and took the name of Pius X.

Within his life span of slightly under eighty years, he crowded in a record of achievement unsurpassed by any figure in modern times. In earthly things, he was always a poor man. As he said in his will: "I was born poor, I lived in poverty, I wish to die poor." In divine things, he abounded in riches and he devoted his whole life, especially his pontificate, to ceaseless effort to induce all men to seek these same riches. His sole aim was "to restore all things in Christ."

In laboring for this restoration he distinguished himself by ever humble, yet ever vigorous leadership. He gave the directive for the codification of

Canon Law. He defied the secularists of his day by bluntly condemning Modernism. He ordered that the music of the liturgy should be made to accord with the prescriptions of Gregorian chant. But perhaps above all else he established himself as "the Pope of the Eucharist." He permitted children to receive First Communion as soon as they reached the use of reason, and he urged all Catholics to the practice of daily Communion.

But in fields other than the purely spiritual, he asserted no less forceful leadership. His constant preoccupation with eternity made him no less the practical man. With realism worthy of his exalted office, he saw clearly that if society was to be won for Christ, the problems of society must come within the active apostolate of the Church. To meet these problems effectively he forged the instrument of Catholic Action whereby the laity under the direction of the Hierarchy would carry Christian solutions to the problems existing in family, economic, social and political life.

On June 11, 1905, Pius X issued his still famous *Il Fermo Proposito*, an encyclical which places his name high in the list of those great social apos-

* 6363 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans, 18, La., June 15, 1951.

ties who have struggled for the Christian reconstruction of society. In this encyclical he outlines the nature and methods of Catholic Action. Pius X makes it clear that no Catholic can exempt himself from participating in Catholic Action:

It is plainly necessary that everyone take part in a work so important, not only for the sanctification of his own soul, but also in order to spread and more fully extend the Kingdom of God in individuals, in families and in society—each one working according to his own strength for his neighbor's good....

IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL ACTION

The importance which Pius X attached to Social Action is clear from the passage cited immediately below. The underscoring appears in the original text. It is one of the few instances in this encyclical in which Pius gave such emphasis to his thought.

Our predecessor Leo XIII . . . pointed out . . . in the famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum* and in later documents the object to which Catholic Action should be specially devoted, namely, *the practical solution of the social question according to Christian principles*.

Thus the tie-in between Catholic Action and Social Action is so intimate that only with difficulty, if at all, can one be distinguished from the other.

A further indication of the importance of gearing Catholic Action to the solution of the social problem is evident from another passage of *Il-*

Fermo Proposito. Pius X seems restive until he can make clear what he considers the most important project to which organized Catholic Action should devote itself. Like Pius XI and Pius XII, who would succeed him, he is preoccupied with the plight of the great masses constituting the working classes.

You see well what support is given to the Church by those chosen bands of Catholics whose aim is to unite all their forces in order to combat anti-Christian civilization by every just and lawful means . . . ; to reinstate Jesus Christ in the family, the school and society; to re-establish the principle that human authority represents that of God; to take intimately to heart the interest of the people, especially those of the working and agricultural classes, not only by the inculcation of religion . . . but also by striving . . . to soothe their sufferings, and by wise measures to improve their economic condition; to endeavor, consequently, to make public laws conformable to justice, to amend or suppress those which are not so; finally, with a true Catholic spirit, to defend and support the rights of God in everything, and the no less sacred rights of the Church.

All these works, of which Catholic laymen are the principal supporters and promoters . . . constitute what is generally known by a distinctive and surely a very noble name: *Catholic Action*.

This passage calls to mind a statement made some thirty years later by the then Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli:

In the complexity of the modern world, the working classes take on a growing importance that it would be

stupid and unjust to underestimate. The extent to which the representatives of labor are penetrated with the principles of the Gospel will decide in large measure the extent to which the society of tomorrow will be Christian.

Pius X warns in *Il Fermo Proposito* that without a supernatural basis Catholic Action cannot attain its end.

To carry it out rightly, we must have divine grace, and the apostle receives none if he is not united to Christ. Only when we have formed Jesus Christ within ourselves shall we more easily be able to give Him back to the family and to society.

If such a disposition of soul is lacking:

... it will be difficult to stir others to good and strength will fail for bearing perseveringly the weariness which every apostolate brings with it: the calumnies of enemies, the coldness and want of help from men good in themselves, and sometimes the jealousy of friends and fellow-workers—excusable, doubtless, on account of the weakness of human nature, but very harmful, and a cause of discord, offense and quarrels.

While still at his See in Venice, Cardinal Sarto saw the great need for an organized apostolate of action. In his day as in our own, however, there were many who feared such bold strategy. To these he addressed a strong but fatherly rebuke:

Catholic Action will not please certain timid souls, who, though good-living, are so attached to their habitual quiet and so afraid of every innovation that they believe it is quite sufficient to

pray, because God knows best how to defend the faith, humiliate His enemies, and make the Church triumphant. But these good people, whom I would call optimists, will wait in vain for society to re-Christianize itself simply by the prayers of the good. Prayer is absolutely necessary because in the ordinary economy of salvation God does not concede graces except to him who prays, but India and Japan would never have been converted by the prayers alone of Xavier; the Apostles would never have conquered the world, if they had not done the work of heroes and martyrs. It is necessary, therefore, to join prayer with action.

There are others who, in order to justify their inertia, give the world up for lost, since they see in it so many evils. These people, whom I would call pessimists, say that it is so much wasted time to talk of Committees, of Circles, of Societies; that they will never accomplish anything. It is sufficient to remind these wearied and dispirited souls that this kind of work of Catholic Action has been commanded by the Pope . . ."

... We must tell these . . . clearly and distinctly that these innovations are both beautiful and good; that as the bad unite, so also must the good; that if they are innovations, they are desired by the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and that he who does not obey the Pope does not obey God.

In the sermon of Beatification, Pius XII exhorted the faithful to pray to his saintly predecessor that he obtain peace for the world, the Peace of Christ within the Kingdom of Christ. In that prayer, we humbly join.

Editorials

An Anniversary Tribute

THE two encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, are among the very great documents of history—like *Magna Carta* and our own *Declaration of Independence* and the *Constitution*. This month of May the Catholic world pays tribute to the anniversaries of the encyclicals. The story of those tributes makes a grand story—a story to the credit and inspiration of Catholics. The story behind the tributes is a far grander story still.

It is not yet heaven on this earth for the workingman—and never will be—but now in 1951 it is no longer so true everywhere as it was in 1891 that, in the words of Leo XIII, “a very few and exceedingly rich men have laid a *yoke almost of slavery* on the unnumbered masses of non-owning workers.” (Italics ours).

In the 19th century English law forbade workers even to meet to discuss their conditions. *A labor union was a criminal conspiracy!* In 1824, 1838 and 1846, English laborers were transported into penal servitude, before they could dare perpetrate the unspeakable offense of asking their masters for a few more shillings a week in wages.

The brutally arrogant attempt was made to transfer the legalized injustices of English law courts into law in the United States. In 1842, in our own rightly beloved Commonwealth of Massachusetts, some boot-makers were indicted for the felonious conspiracy of uniting to obtain shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions. Chief Justice Shaw of the Massachusetts Supreme Court threw the indictment out the window. Mr. Justice Shaw ruled for the right of workingmen to form their own unions. There, thank Heaven, in our own State was one of the very first moves to deliver the laborer from the bondage of a cruelly long work-day, from the mockery of inhumanly low wages—from the slums that were the dwelling of the toiling poor.

We can have some understanding of what was the actual condition of the workingman in the decades before 1891 by trying to realize afresh that the workingman did not always enjoy the protection and support of those laws which are now common practice. Many modern laws are a revolutionary change, for the better, in the condition of labor. By *Rerum Novarum*, Leo XIII gave a mighty impetus to that revolutionizing improvement.

The essential elements of these good laws were made plain and precise by the Catholic Bishops of the United States in the Bishops' Program formulated and declared in 1919. For the honor of our American Bishops—as a tribute to *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, whose work continues in the Bishops' Program—for the nourishing of the confidence and honorable pride of Catholics in their divinely constituted leaders, we here recapitulate the proposals for which the Bishops stood and stand in forthrightness, justice and religion.

(1) Minimum wage legislation; (2) insurance against unemployment, sickness, disability and old age; (3) a sixteen-year minimum age limit for working children; (4) legal protection for the right of labor to organize; (5) continuation of the National War Labor Board to handle matters affecting the relations of employers and employees; (6) a national employment service; (7) public housing for the working people; (8) no general reduction of war-time wages and a long distance program for increasing them; (9) prevention of excess profits and income through regulation of public utilities and through progressive taxes on inheritance and income, and excess profits; (10) participation of labor in management and a wider distribution of ownership; (11) effective control of monopolies even by the

method of government competition, if that should become necessary.

There is indeed a change for the better in the condition of labor, which was the subject of *Rerum Novarum*. The social order, with which *Quadragesimo Anno* was concerned, has indeed been in many respects reconstructed into a world more fit for the sons of God.

In honoring those encyclicals Catholics honor themselves as well as cultivate their fields for a bountiful harvest for themselves and all their neighbors. We do not justly and fully honor those two encyclicals, if we fail to recall the great American Catholics who were intimately and effectively associated with them.

The story of Cardinal Gibbons has been told again and again. It can and should be briefly resumed here in justice to the Cardinal, and in some hope (though faint) of impressing a generation which knows all the answers about trivialities but is seldom aware of the things that count.

In the 1870's the Knights of Labor were the first organized national movement in the United States in the cause of the worker. The Knights had to pay for their principles. They tried to protect their membership by an oath of secrecy. There were other good men who dreaded secret societies and revolution. The Canadian Bishops obtained from Rome a ban

upon the Knights of Labor. The intelligence, the humanitarianism and Christianity alive in Cardinal Gibbons spurred him to spend himself that men seeking social justice should not be condemned. It is to his immortal glory that he persuaded Leo XIII to see the Knights of Labor as a good organization and to lift the ban laid upon them. From that victory for social justice and the Faith, Cardinal Gibbons proceeded to open the way for the writing of *Rerum Novarum*. Cardinal Gibbons was a great American and a great Bishop!

It is very much to our point and purpose here to recall another great American Catholic: Monsignor John A. Ryan. Monsignor Ryan fought the good fight for the workingman. It was he who drafted the Bishops' Program of 1919. It is not rash to hold that history will record *Quadragesimo Anno* as, in a very real sense, a seal of approval upon the life and work of John A. Ryan, priest and American.—THE CATHOLIC MIRROR, Springfield Mass., June, 1951.

Anniversary of the Labor Encyclicals

SIXTY years ago, on May 15, 1891, Pope Leo XIII issued *Rerum Novarum*. Forty years later, on May 15, 1931, Pope Pius XI issued *Quadragesimo Anno*. On May 20, throughout the Diocese of Hartford, by direction of Bishop O'Brien, the anni-

versaries of these two great encyclicals will be observed and instructions will be given in every church on the message which they contain, a message which is being carried so effectively into action throughout Connecticut by our own Diocesan Labor Institute under the inspiring leadership of the Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly and his able corps of directors and assistant directors.

What is the message of the encyclicals? It is impossible to give it within the limits of an editorial. Only by reading the encyclicals themselves can anyone arrive at their full purport and meaning; for they are not vague and verbose documents containing many words and little thought. They are already so highly compressed that no adequate summary of their contents can be given. They are already summaries and digests of the full doctrine of the Church on the social relationships of mankind.

These social relationships are not as they were some 200 years ago. The industrial revolution, bringing to the world for the first time in great quantities and varieties the power-driven machine, has changed them immeasurably for better or for worse. The rise of mass production, the decline of private ownership, the lessening importance of individual craftsmanship have brought on an instability in the social order and a sense of insecurity among the individual members of society which

leave hardly anyone with the certainty of a peaceful, well-established and reasonably assured mode of living. We are in the midst of disturbing revolutionary changes, leading perhaps, at some future date, to a new and, we hope, better culture. At present, however, the changes have led only to an economic confusion which generates in many a feeling of hopelessness, if not downright despair, and forms in them so strong a conviction of the futility of human existence that a whole philosophy has been based on it.

Long before social conflict and social confusion became acute the prophetic Pope, Leo XIII, saw what was happening. The very first paragraph of *Rerum Novarum*, marvelously succinct and accurate, expressed what some wise men already were aware of but were not able to put into adequate words. Said the great Pope:

The spirit of revolutionary change, long predominant in the nations of the world, when once aroused, gradually passed beyond the bounds of politics and made itself felt in the cognate field of practical economy. The elements of the conflict are unmistakable. We perceive them in the growth of industry and the marvellous discoveries of science; in the changed relations of employers and working-men; in the enormous fortunes of individuals and the poverty of the masses; in the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the labor population; and, finally, in a general moral deterioration.

The momentous seriousness of the

present state of things, indeed, just now fills every mind with painful apprehension. Wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it. There is, in fact, nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention.

So spoke Pope Leo XIII. But what have his words to do with us today? And, anyway, isn't the Church's business with the salvation of souls rather than with the wages and living conditions of workingmen? The answer to both questions is not difficult. A study of *Rerum Novarum* will convince the unprejudiced rather that the encyclical is not merely timely today, but even in advance of our times. If that is not enough, then Pope Pius XI's reinforcement and amplification of his predecessor's encyclical should bring final conviction.

As for the Church's business with the condition of the workingmen, it is the business of Christ, whose divinely appointed agent the Church is here on earth. Wherever there is a denial and a repudiation of the faith and morals of Christ, there the Church must go to defend His Gospel and establish His law. This is her mission and she cannot fail in it. She cannot remain within cloistered walls while injustice and infidelity are abroad in the world.

So she must speak as Pope Pius XI spoke in the last paragraph of his *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Let all men of good will who under the pastors of the Church wish to fight this good and peaceful fight of Christ, stand united! Let all, under the leadership and instruction of the Church, strive to play their part—each according to his talents, powers and station—in the Christian renewal of human society which Leo XIII inaugurated in his immortal encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. Let them seek, not themselves and the things that are their own, but the things that are Jesus Christ's. Let them not urge their own ideas with undue persistence, but be ready to abandon them, however admirable, should the greater common good seem to require it; that in all and above all Christ may reign and rule, to Whom be honor and glory and power forever and ever.—THE CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, Hartford, Conn., May 17, 1951.

Two Great Documents

NEAR the middle of the 19th century two men, unknown to each other, spent several years at Brussels in Belgium. Both were passionately interested in social questions and both observed at first hand the terrible evils of *laissez-faire* capitalism in that small but highly industrialized country. One was Karl Marx. His program of reform was embodied in the *Communist Manifesto* and in *Das Kapital*. The other became pope under the name of Leo XIII. His program was proclaimed to the world on May 15, 1891 in an encyclical called "The Condition of Labor." Pope Pius XI restated and elaborated the Leonine teaching in an encyclical

issued on May 15, 1931, entitled "Reconstructing the Social Order." On May 15, we celebrate the sixtieth and twentieth anniversaries of these two great documents.

The reception afforded the widely divergent social doctrines of Marx and of Leo is a sad commentary on human nature and the faith of Catholics. The teachings of Marx have been adopted as the Communist bible; they have been studied, analyzed and applied; they have been spread over the earth with a fanatical and violent zeal.

The teachings of Leo and Pius have had a mixed reception. They are little known outside the Church. An élite few among Catholics have received them with enthusiasm and have tried to apply their principles to the solution of the pressing problems of our modern industrial society. Some Catholics have opposed them as the unauthoritative pronouncements of ecclesiastics who know little about the economic laws that rule our industrial world. The average Catholic, if he has heard of them at all, has only the faintest idea of what they are about.

Many Catholics were scandalized at the bold teachings of Leo XIII. After sixty years and added Papal pronouncements on social questions, a large percentage of Catholics are as reactionary as their grandparents in 1891. They feel that in her social

teachings the Church is leaving her altars to descend into the market place, that she is involving herself in matters that are not her concern.

The fact is, of course, that the Church is entirely within her sphere in interesting herself in the moral aspects of our industrial problems. She cannot admit a divorce between business and morality; she does not teach a religion restricted to Sundays or by the four walls of the church; she does not propound a code of morality that affects a man's private life but overlooks his business and public life. The Church has a place—and by divine right—wherever human beings think and live and act.

And the Church has an interest too in worldly goods. She recommends detachment, but she is an enemy of poverty—at least of a poverty so great that it forces a man to neglect the spiritual in order to concentrate all his efforts on obtaining the bare necessities of life. She is an enemy of the poverty that creates slums, that forces women and children into factories, that contracts the whole horizon of life to the absolute essentials of food, clothing and shelter. The Church knows that people ground down by such poverty too often turn a deaf ear to her spiritual message while they listen to the siren voices of false saviors.

In the areas of social justice and social charity there are grave deficiencies in our American industrial

life. The encyclicals provide the remedies—but they do not provide them ready-made. They offer a guide, a set of principles, a beacon light, a philosophy rather than a detailed, concrete program. Application of these principles here and now to our particular problems requires study, intelligence, prudence and a never-flagging enthusiasm. Perhaps it would not be invidious to recommend that for the anniversary of the two great Papal documents, we resolve to learn a lesson of zeal from the followers of Marx.—THE SIGN, *Union City, N. J., May, 1951.*

The Wisdom of Leo

MAY 15 marks the sixtieth anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's great social encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, issued on May 15, 1891. This document, together with its supplement *Quadragesimo Anno* published twenty years ago by Pope Pius XI, sums up Catholic social thought as it has developed in face of the critical problems of the modern industrial era. The first of the two great letters was issued in the heyday of Liberal-Capitalism, at a time when it required great courage to oppose views and practices which were then predominant, and accepted by the general body of well-to-do Catholics and Catholic political leaders. Many of these were dismayed, while radical social idealists were agreeably

surprised, when the Papacy once again appeared, as of old, to act as champion of the "forgotten men" of that peaceful and apparently progressive and prosperous age. The terms of Leo's plea for the oppressed and disinherited, and vindication of human rights trampled under and ignored by the rich and powerful, may now appear somewhat commonplace: but to that age they seemed revolutionary—its phrases were not platitudes, but thunderbolts. They exploded the oft-repeated lie that Catholicism was the natural ally of "capitalist reaction" against social progress, and that its aim was to keep the workers subservient by comforting them with the hopes of "pie in the sky."

Under the inspiration of "the Christian Charter of Labor" a movement of social study was begun by clerics and laity, in which the unchanging principles of Catholic social ethics were applied to the new human situation. This bore fruit, in its turn, in the gradual emergence of the great Christian-democratic movements of our own age, whose bold and practical spirit of reform enabled them to take a leading part in European life, as champions of the "common man" against the new menace of totalitarian tyranny and servitude, which has now overtopped the older evil of irresponsible capitalist greed. The social science of the Church has not remained an academic thing hid-

den in obscurity: it has been brought into the full noonday of public life: and the doctrines which Leo set forth have penetrated not only throughout the Catholic world, but among those outside it, becoming "part of the intellectual heritage of the whole human race," as the late Pope Pius XI truly declared.

In his recent message to the Madrid Workers' Congress, Pius XII declared that "*without the Church the social question is insoluble; but she cannot solve it alone*. She needs the collaboration of the intellectual, economic and technical forces of the public powers." In this the Holy Father was merely echoing the words of Leo, his predecessor, who called for the concurrence of "the rulers of States, the employers of labor, the wealthy, and the working classes themselves" in a common effort, with one heart and mind. The reason why the social question is "insoluble" without the Church should be obvious to Christians. The heart of that question is not—as secularists and Marxian Socialists of every school hold—merely economic. The question of social well-being cannot be considered realistically apart from the question of man's nature and destiny, and the fundamental aims of social life.

Modern "scientific" thought is, in this respect, coming gradually round to our standpoint, and realizing the need to consider *basic human psychology* in social relationships and

economic design, as well as matters connected with wages, material welfare and hours of employment and leisure. "The good life" is coming into the center of the picture, as the supreme aim of social planning, rather than the equalization of wealth and status, and the provision of plenty; and a growing number of theorists are coming to see that this involves the satisfaction of the spiritual needs of the common man, as well as the restoration of dignity, self-determination and varied interest to his way of life, and the stability and security of the "family cell." So long as we have a "culture of cities" and a system of production, distribution and exchange which involves the degradation of men by continuous machine-like tasks without human meaning or interest, we have only the alternatives of endemic social conflict and discontent, or the servile acquiescence of men whose humanity has become dwarfed and enfeebled. While the typical social programs of our time tend to eliminate private choice and responsibility in order to impose the planned bureaucratic patterns of the "welfare state," the tendency will be for the natural virtues of plain men to degenerate, and for social irresponsibility to increase: and the process is aided by public "education" systems which provide no social, spiritual or moral formation for them in their growing years.

The more enlightened thinkers of today are beginning, we say, to understand this, though the politicians and bureaucrats still tend to think and plan in outworn materialistic terms: so that, if Armageddon does not overwhelm our Western civilization, we may yet see a return to Christian Faith by way of the recognition of the sanities of Christian social humanism.

We shall, in a word, catch up with the thought of Leo XIII. For, as that sage Pontiff showed in another great letter on "Christian Democracy," the productiveness of capital could be doubled and the conditions, wages and hours of the workers correspondingly improved, without bringing social prosperity or ending social misery, because of the vices caused by the lack of religious culture. "Without the instincts which the Christian religion implants and keeps alive—without providence, self-control, thrift, endurance and other qualities—you may try your hardest, but prosperity you cannot provide." It is a lesson which our planners with their pills for every social ill are slow to understand; but which applies very aptly to our Australian world in this era of full employment, social services, high living standards—and bitter and growing social conflict. The Church has never lost sight of this central truth, as Pius XII pointed out: "Always, everywhere, from the Epistle to Philemon to the

social teachings of the Popes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, she labored to obtain more concern for *man* than for technical advantages." That is why she defends private property as an indefeasible right needed for social freedom, while demanding its just distribution so that it may be more widely enjoyed. That is why she demands a just wage, sufficient for the worker to build and maintain a home and save, rather than a network of social services which increase the plain man's dependence on the State, and, therefore, make him less capable of resisting social tyranny and corruption.

The world today has changed vastly since the days of Leo XIII: but the evils of insecurity, greed, social injustice and internecine hatred and conflict remain with us: and the advice of the Pope to employers and workers and those who govern remains as cogent as ever. "It is shameful and inhuman," he declared, "to treat men like chattels to make

money by, to look upon them as so much muscle and physical power." Yet this inhuman attitude is still common in industry, even where material conditions have been improved and wages are in conformity with the law. There are employers who take every opportunity to "put one across their workpeople when they are in a weak position, and capitalists who exercise pressure upon the needs of the people through their control of the materials of production. On the other hand, the worker still needs the Pope's reminder "to beware of sedition and seditious persons . . . to hold inviolate the rights of everyone else; to show willingly due deference to masters and to do honest work." Finally, all alike need to realize that *personal responsibility is inescapable* and that there can be no social reform without the reform of the individual, no end to abuses without the improvement of his moral standards.—THE ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia, May 10, 1951.



Duty of Employers

Among the most important duties of employers the principal one is to give every worker what is justly due him. Assuredly, to establish a rule of pay in accord with justice, many factors must be taken into account. But, in general, the rich and employers should remember that no laws, either human or divine, permit them for their own profit to oppress the needy and the wretched or to seek gain from another's want.—*Rerum Novarum*, N. 32.

Documentation

Church's Concern for Economic Life

HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XII

Text of a radio address delivered March 11, 1951 to the Catholic men of Spain, employers and workers.

BELOVED children, employers, technicians and Spanish workers, who have assembled in Madrid and in the provincial capitals to consecrate yourselves to Christ the Redeemer and to pay your fervent tribute of filial devotion to His Vicar on earth. What a beautiful spectacle you make—let Us start thus—an imposing mass of workers exalting Jesus as their true Redeemer.

Many have presented themselves, and present themselves especially in these later times, waving the flag of redemption to the worker, to the man of hard and difficult life for whom today's problems fail to drown out tomorrow's worries. You, however, follow faithfully the banner of Christ. And you confess openly and solemnly with the first Pope, St. Peter: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts, 4, 12). To Him, to His Church, to the successor of Peter you want to remain faithful at any cost. But loyalty is repaid with loyalty. And because you undoubtedly expect from Us in these moments a message on what the Church can offer you for the security of your existence and the satisfaction of your just aspirations, We want to express this message with all our paternal affection. Here it is in three points:

1. No one can accuse the Church of having disregarded the workers and the social question, or of not having given them and it their due importance.

Few questions have occupied the Church so much as these two from the day when, sixty years ago, Our great predecessor Leo XIII, with his encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, put into the hands of the workers the Magna Carta of their rights.

The Church has been and is always fully conscious of her responsibility. Without the Church the social question is insoluble. But neither can she solve it alone. She needs the collaboration of the intellectual, economic and technical resources of leaders in public life.

She has offered for her part wide and well-planned programs for the religious-moral arrangement of all the social order. The social legislation of the different countries is, for the greater part, no more than the application of the principles established by the Church.

Do not forget either that all that is good and just in other systems is already in Catholic social doctrine.

And when goals which the Church rejects are ascribed to the workers' movement, these always concern illusory objectives which sacrifice truth, human dignity and the genuine welfare of all the citizens.

2. In its 2,000-year history the Church has had to live in the midst of the most diverse social structures, from the ancient one with its slavery to the modern economic system marked by the words capitalism and proletariat. The Church has never preached social revolution; but always and everywhere, from the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon to the social teachings of the Popes of the 19th and 20th centuries, she has worked hard to have more concern shown for the human being than for economic and technical advantages, and to get as many as possible, on their part, to do all they can to live a Christian life and one worthy of a human being.

A MORE JUST DISTRIBUTION

The Church defends the right of private property, a right she considers fundamentally inalienable. But she insists also on the need for a more just distribution of property and deplores the unnatural social situation in which an enormous mass of impoverished people live beside a small group of very rich and privileged. There always will be economic inequalities. But all those who in any way are able to influence the progress of society must aim to obtain a situation which permits people who do the best they can not only to live, but to save. There are many factors which must contribute to a greater diffusion of property. But the principal one always will be a just salary. You know very well, beloved children, that a just salary and a better distribution of natural wealth constitute two of the most impelling demands in the social program of the Church.

She regards with approval and favors everything which, within the limits permitted by circumstances, aims at introducing the elements of a partnership contract (*contrato de sociedad*) into the wage contract (*contrato de trabajo*), and betters the general condition of the worker. The Church likewise counsels all to use whatever contributes toward making relations between employer and workers more human, more Christian and more conducive to mutual confidence. The class struggle can never be a social end. The discussions between employers and workers must have as their main aim peace and collaboration.

3. This work can be achieved only by men who live the faith and fulfill their duties in the spirit of Christ. The solution of the social question never was easy. Now the unspeakable catastrophes of this century have rendered it painfully difficult. Achievement of harmony between the classes, a disposition to sacrifice and mutual respect, simplicity of life, a renunciation of luxury demanded by the actual economic situation: all these and many other things can be obtained only with the aid of Providence and the Grace of God. Be, then, men of prayer. Raise your hands to God so that by His Mercy, and notwithstanding the difficulty, this great work will be realized.

On this occasion We cannot refrain from directing some words of fatherly praise to those institutions which you have created and continue to create in great number to educate young workers, making them excellent specialized workers and at the same time convinced Christians. You could not have done anything better.

In the growth and flourishing of this work We see a promising sign for the future.

The Christian Faith is accused of consoling the mortal being who fights for life with the hope of a life beyond. The Church, it is said, does not know how to aid man on earth. Nothing is more false. You have only to look at the grand past of your dear Spain. Who has done more there than the Church to make family and social life happy and more tranquil? As far as the solution of the present social question is concerned, nobody has presented a program that surpasses the doctrine of the Church in security, consistency and realism.

Therefore its right to exhort and console all is even greater, reminding them that the significance of earthly life is in the beyond, in eternal life. The more you are convinced of this truth, the more you will feel compelled to collaborate toward an acceptable solution of the social question. It will always be true that the most precious thing that the Church can provide for this purpose is a man who, firmly anchored in faith in Christ and an eternal life, will fulfill the aims of this life as a result of this faith.

This was what We wanted to tell you.

A word more, beloved Spanish workers, to accept the tribute to Our humble person and to thank you. As for Us, what shall We tell you in return? Throughout the great Jubilee just ended We saw with Our own eyes, We felt with Our own hands the enthusiastic fervor of the Spanish people for the Pope.

But the Spanish pilgrims—among whom We remember you, dear workers, especially those who attended the closing of the Holy Door—have been able to see and to experience the love that the Pope has for them. "Spain for the Pope!" was their impassioned and uncontainable cry; to which We answered with fatherly love "and the Pope for Spain."

May God bless you, beloved children, and also bless your Fatherland and your leaders as We, with all Our fatherly affection, bless you.

Problems of Rural Life

POPE PIUS XII

Address of His Holiness to members of the International Catholic Congress on Rural Problems, July 2, 1951.

WE BID you welcome, dear sons and daughters, whom a common attachment to Christian principles and to Catholic social doctrine has brought

together from all corners of the earth—some of you from distant countries across the sea, others from nearer points in Europe—to consider problems of

rural life. You make especially clear, at this moment, the spirit in which you have conducted your discussions by expressing the desire that the blessing of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, by its supernatural power, may render fruitful their conclusions and results.

With praiseworthy breadth of vision, your Congress has sought to extend its study to all men who live in rural areas: some of them directly engaged in working the soil, to make it yield vegetable and animal products for the satisfaction of their own and their fellows' needs; others living with or among them to provide them with various necessary services.

Two obvious facts, self evident, should convince the least attentive of the importance of these problems. On the one hand, the fact that the majority of mankind lives on the land, either in isolated farms, or in villages or market towns; on the other hand, the fact that these problems, though of immediate concern to these populations themselves, because of their indirect effects are of primary interest to the whole human race, and are related to the internal structure of the State, and even of the Church, by reason of the profound influence they exercise on the biological and intellectual, spiritual and religious development of humanity.

INDUSTRIAL CAPITALISM AND AGRICULTURE

Our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XI, in his encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, when speaking of the favorable and unfavorable consequences of the economic system of industrial capitalism, had already drawn attention to the dwellers on the land. The question has lost none of its urgency.

Paralleling its pressure on the whole of economic life (and this state of af-

fairs still continues), that economic system had necessarily to make its influence felt on the spiritual, social and material conditions of rural populations. Nay more, today it can be said that the destiny of all mankind is at stake: Will men be successful or not in balancing this influence in such a way as to preserve for the spiritual, social and economic life of the rural world its specific character? Will they succeed in assuring it, if not a preponderant, at least an equal impact on the life of the human family as a whole?

Could it be that there are irreconcilable causes of conflict in this area? By no means. From the very fact that one lives in the natural conditions of human life and its perfecting, the division of labor and functions does not of necessity engender conflicts of this kind. Everyone of good will must recognize that the system of industrial capitalism has helped render possible, and has even stimulated, an increase in agricultural production; that it has permitted, in many regions of the world, higher levels of physical and spiritual life for rural people. It is not, then, the system itself which is to be opposed, but rather the danger it would run if its influence were to succeed in altering the specific character of rural living, by assimilating it to the life of urban and industrial centers, by making of the "country," as we understand it here, a simple extension of the "city."

Such a program, with the theory which supports it, is false and harmful. As is well known, Marxism professes just such a theory. It has fallen into the idolatrous worship of technology and industrialization to an extreme degree. The "collectivization" of agricultural labor, after the manner of a factory, the degradation of the countryside, reduced to nothing more than a reserve of manpower for industrial

production—this is where Marxism leads. But this is where the principles of economic liberalism also lead, once the pursuit of gain, on the part of finance capitalism, bears with all its weight upon economic life; once the interrelations of the national economy are considered exclusively from the point of view of the market as a price mechanism. And note that the consequences are identical for rural populations abused by industrial capitalism: either they become mere reservoirs of manpower, or they remain lethargic in the midst of a miserable existence, subject to the most dangerous tensions.

Without being the sole cause of the rural "exodus," today deplored nearly everywhere, the preponderant part given to the interests of industrial capitalism, in the production and distribution of income, plays its role here. It would, therefore, be an understatement to speak of the painful phenomenon as merely a "leaving the farm." Rather the word "exodus" should be used, in all honesty, to make plain to everyone how a one-sided evolution of the economy ends by wrecking the human and social structure of an entire people. Finally, for want of a capable and enterprising rural population, the soil, allowed to go fallow through lack of care, or exhausted through unskillful overcropping, loses gradually its natural productivity, and the social economy itself is swept along into a crisis of the gravest sort.

Today, men have the opportunity of deciding whether they will continue to follow a policy of one-sided and short-sighted "quest of profits," or rather will begin to direct it toward the totality of the social economy, which is its objective end. Here are some examples: contemplated assistance to "underdeveloped" regions; agrarian reform, happily begun here and there; emigration and immigration, encouraged by

international arrangements; a better regional grouping of complementary national economies; a better distribution of productive forces within national boundaries. All these measures should have for their purpose, among others, to assure rural people everywhere their proper character, their proper influence, their proper value in the economy and society.

It is exactly that which must be borne in mind when one deplores the defects and clashes in human relations, resulting from the labor structure in the world of industrial capitalism. Complaint is made, in effect, that labor has, as it were, "lost its soul," that is to say, the personal and social sense of human living. Complaint is made that labor, oppressed on all sides by a complexity of organizations, sees this human life transformed into a giant automaton, of which men are only the unconscious cogs. Complaint is made that technology, "standardizing" every move, works to the detriment of the individuality and personality of the worker.

FAMILY-TYPE FARM

A single remedy, universally applicable, would be difficult to find. It is none the less true that the work of the farm acts as a powerful defense against all these disorders. We are thinking here first of the peasant farm, of the family-type farm. Of such is made up that rural class which by reason of its over-all social character, and also by reason of its economic function, forms as it were the nucleus of a healthy rural population. To say this is not to deny the utility, often the necessity, of larger farm enterprises. Nevertheless, in permanent contact with nature, as God created and governs it, the worker in the fields knows by daily experience that human life is in the hands of its Author. No other working group is so

suited as his to the life of the family, viewed as a spiritual, economic and juridical unit, and also in the matter of production and consumption. However hard this work may be, man finds himself still master of his world through action at the heart of the community: of the family, of the neighborhood, and also, secondarily, of various economic cooperatives, provided, nevertheless, that these remain in all truth, and not merely as a matter of form, grounded on the responsibility of the entire membership. As regards modern technology, in the full measure in which it should place itself at the service of the individual farm enterprise, it will adapt itself naturally to the concrete situation in each particular case. Thus it will leave intact the individual character of agricultural labor.

Far be it from Us to indulge an unreal romanticism. With such patience and tact, it is necessary to place the farm world once more on the path of its salvation, master its defects, overcome the fascination for a world which is alien to it.

Furthermore, modern social legisla-

tion should also offer its advantages to rural people, but in conformity with their specific character. Above all, let them be given the opportunity for a careful education, wisely adapted to their needs, which will stimulate their professional betterment. Besides—which goes without saying—We could not insist too strongly that Catholic populations be given a solid Catholic formation.

It is particularly satisfying to Us to be able to welcome your Congress precisely at this time, when agricultural organizations and agencies, already of proven capacity, have established their headquarters in the Eternal City, or continue to develop their activity here. And We are happy to assure all the agencies and offices of the United Nations, destined to bring international assistance to the working man, that the Church is ever prepared to support their efforts with her most sympathetic collaboration.

With all Our heart We pray divine providence to bless these many efforts, and We bestow on you with deep affection, Our Apostolic Benediction.

The Social Encyclicals

MOST REV. CHARLES D. WHITE

Bishop of Spokane

A pastoral letter issued May 8, 1951.

WE CANNOT allow May 15 of this year to go by without reminding you of the issuance of two documents of major importance for the whole world, the one just sixty years ago and the other twenty years ago this coming

Tuesday: Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, and Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. These two great documents have for society yet today a very practical, and not just an academic, value. They both concern

not only the queen of the virtues, Christian charity, but also that other virtue vitally necessary for human welfare, namely, social justice. There can be no genuine nor stable peace in society, whether between classes within a nation, or between nations, unless the principles of social justice are observed.

SUPREME AUTHORITY

It should be evident to all Catholics that when the Vicar of Christ formally discusses social justice and its concomitant issues of property, ownership, employment, industry, profits, work, competition, monopolies, he is not treating matters outside his sphere as Sovereign Pontiff. He is speaking officially because economic problems are basically moral problems. "There reside in us," wrote Pius XI, "the right and duty to pronounce with supreme authority upon social and economic matters. Certainly the Church was not given the commission to guide men to an only fleeting and perishable happiness but to that which is eternal. Indeed the Church 'holds that it is unlawful for her to mix without cause in those temporal concerns'; however, she can in no wise renounce the duty God entrusted to her to interpose her authority, not of course in matters of technique, for which she is neither suitably equipped nor endowed by office, but in all things that are connected with the moral law."

It is not our intention in this letter to review or synopsise the encyclicals, but rather to emphasize the need both for employers and employes, as well as people generally, to study these documents carefully. We say study, for no merely cursory reading of them will suffice to arrive at a clear and definite understanding of the principles upon which a just economic order must be erected.

In formulating a program of action

in any department of human affairs, whether political or social or economic or any other, first consideration must be given to basing the program on the true principles of justice. No building can be more stable than its foundation. After enunciating the essential principles for virtuous living, Our Lord concluded His Sermon on the Mount in these words:

"Everyone who hears these My words and acts upon them, shall be likened to a wise man who built his house on rock. And the rain fell, and the floods came and the winds blew and beat against that house, but it did not fall, because it was founded on rock. And everyone who hears these My words and does not act upon them, shall be likened to a foolish man who built his house on sand. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell, and was utterly ruined." (Matt. vii, 24-27)

FALSE PRINCIPLES

There are certain false principles underlying particular economic systems, principles which in our country are quite generally repudiated. Such, for example, is the denial of the right of private ownership, one of the principles upon which Communism and, to a lesser extent, Socialism are based. But there are also certain other false and vicious principles which in the past and, to a certain extent, even up to the present time have been advocated—some of them quite widely—in this country. Among those principles is that which regards labor as a mere commodity, and the amount of the wage paid to workmen to be determined by the law of supply and demand. That principle is illustrated by the answer of one of the largest capitalists of the country when, as a witness at a Senate hearing some years ago, he was asked whether he con-

sidered one dollar a day a sufficient wage for a longshoreman. His answer was illuminating. "I think one dollar a day is a sufficient wage," he replied, "if you can get longshoremen for that wage." How contrary that philosophy is to the teachings of Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum*:

"Let it be granted that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice."

RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

Another false principle, happily no longer widely advocated, is the denial of the employe's right to organize unions. In England in the 19th century courts condemned men to banishment to Botany Bay who attempted to organize to secure their rights as wage earners. In our own country, not so many years ago, workmen suffered from unjust treatment for that same reason. What is the teaching of the Catholic Church in this matter? Listen to the words of Pope Leo: "To enter into a society of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State must protect natural rights, not destroy them; and if it forbids its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very purpose of its own existence." Referring to that teaching of Leo XIII, Pope Pius XI added: "There were even some Catholics who looked askance at the efforts of workers to form associations of this type as if

they smacked of a Socialistic or revolutionary spirit."

To mention one other false principle, that of unlimited competition in business. An example of this economic heresy is provided by the School of Business, Columbia University, through one of its professors who writes: "Under a state of free and unlimited competition the correction for an excessive supply of a commodity is through bankruptcy." The professor then goes on to justify this "dog-eat-dog" philosophy. In refutation of this error Pius XI wrote:

"Just as the unity of human society cannot be founded on an opposition of classes, so also the right ordering of economic life cannot be left to a free competition of forces. For from this source, as from a poisoned spring, have originated and spread all the errors of individualist economic teaching. Destroying through forgetfulness or ignorance the social and moral character of economic life, it held that economic life must be considered and treated as altogether free from and independent of public authority, because in the market, that is, in the free struggle of competitors, it would have a principle of self-direction which governs it much more perfectly than would the intervention of any created intellect. But free competition, while justified and certainly useful, provided it is kept within certain limits, clearly cannot direct economic life—a truth which the outcome of the application in practice of the tenets of this evil individualistic spirit has more than sufficiently demonstrated. It is most necessary, therefore, that economic life be again subjected to and governed by a true and effective directing principle. This function is one that the economic dictatorship which has recently displaced free competition can still less perform."

The supreme importance of erecting

the economic edifice upon an immovable foundation, that is, upon the eternal principles of justice and charity, should be evident. To point out those principles is one of the functions of Christ's Church. As Leo XIII writes: "No practical solution of this question will ever be found without the assistance of religion and the Church. It is We who are the chief guardian of religion, and the chief dispenser of what belongs to the Church, and We must not by silence neglect the duty that lies upon Us. Doubtless this most serious question demands the attention and the efforts of others besides ourselves—of the rulers of states, of employers of labor, of the wealthy, and of the working population themselves for whom We plead. But We affirm without hesitation that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church." In this pronouncement the Pope's emphasis upon the need and duty of others as well as the Church to solve economic problems, should not be overlooked. The Church points out the true principles. It is for the world of industry, management and labor, working together, to adapt and apply those principles.

SOLID BASIS

Let us emphasize how vitally important it is to cling steadfastly to sound principles and not to desert them because of their abuse howsoever widespread. Just as there are those who would abolish capitalism because it has been grossly abused, so also there are those who would deny to workmen the right to form unions because of certain abuses of that right. Both attitudes are extreme and wrong.

The radical defect in the efforts of so many to erect an economic system that will make for the supreme interests of human welfare is their failure to recog-

nize that no economic system can attain its purpose if divorced from the moral law. Even yet today how many there are who look upon economics as an abstract science detached from the moral law. "It is the opinion of some, and the error is already very common," wrote Leo XIII, "that the social question is merely an economic one, whereas, in point of fact, it is first of all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason its settlement is to be sought mainly in the moral law and the pronouncements of religion." (*Graves de communi*, Jan. 18, 1901)

CHRISTIAN ETHICS

In concluding this exhortation to all, but especially to employers and employees, to study deeply the social encyclicals, we would quote the following words of an eminent economist:

"Changes in our economic and political systems will have only partial and feeble efficacy if they be not reinforced by the Christian view of work and wealth. No program of betterment or reconstruction will prove reasonably effective without a reform in the spirit of both labor and capital. The laborer must come to realize that he owes his employer and society an honest day's work in return for a fair wage, and that conditions cannot be substantially improved until he roots out the desire to get a maximum of return for a minimum of service. The capitalist must likewise get a new viewpoint. He needs to learn the long forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship, that profit-making is not the basic justification of business enterprise, and that there are such things as fair profits, fair interest and fair prices. Above and before all, he must cultivate and strengthen within his mind this truth, namely, that the laborer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production; and that the

laborer's right to a decent livelihood is the first moral charge upon industry. The employer has a right to get a reasonable living out of his business, but he has no right to interest on his invest-

ment until his employes have obtained at least living wages. This is the human and Christian, in contrast to the purely commercial and pagan, ethics of industry."

Minimum Wage Laws

MOST REV. GABRIEL M. REYES
Archbishop of Manila

Statement issued May 1, 1951 praising the adoption of a minimum wage law by the Philippine Legislature.

THIS is, indeed, a step in the right direction. This law, if enforced, will provide at least some protection for the weakest members of society, the unorganized workers. By this step the State takes cognizance of its solemn duty to protect the workers and see that none take advantage of their position to enforce upon them a wage wholly inadequate but against which they are powerless to make any effective objection whatsoever.

This law should be the first step of a serious study on the part of our legislators as to how they can take much more vigorous legislative steps to raise the living standards of our workers and to protect their right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers through their freely-chosen representatives. It is a beginning. Let us pray that it will be followed by still more enlightened efforts. Let us translate our prayer into action.

All Catholics should make it their special concern to see that this law is enforced. The fear has been expressed in some quarters that the payment of the wages required by this new law will

adversely affect our economy. Enlightened men know that, far from harming the economy, this added purchasing power—meager though it be—in the hands of the workers will act as a healthy stimulant to the production, transportation and sale of goods.

It is axiomatic among economists that without adequate purchasing power in the hands of the people, no economy can be healthy and vigorous. Any prosperity not based on this solid foundation will be at most an artificial prosperity for a few and one that is dependent mainly on foreign markets, since our own people would not have the wherewithal to buy their own products. . . .

Far from complaining and seeking exceptions to the law, wealthy men should instigate a holy rivalry in increasing the real income of the workers. No one has the right to deem that he has satisfied his duties of conscience toward the workers when he has paid this bare minimum wage. Remember, it is not intended to be a just wage or a family wage; it is a mere minimum, the payment of which is required by law under pain of criminal prosecution.

Those whose business enterprises are in a condition to pay more are obliged in conscience to do so and to strive that each of their workers receives the full family living wage. . . .

It is the duty of all, workers and employers alike, to seek every reasonable means, peaceful and intelligent means, of bringing about that condition in which each worker may have a decent home, proper food and clothing for his

family, a chance to educate his children, something for sickness and old age and an opportunity to become a modest owner of property. If we wish to stave off the madness of a Communist revolution—and what lover of his family, his country, his God does not?—we must exert all our efforts to build the truly Christian social order in which all men may live in simple comfort with their families.



Twofold Character of Ownership

First, then, let it be considered as certain and established that neither Leo nor those theologians who have taught under the guidance and authority of the Church have ever denied or questioned the twofold character of ownership, called usually individual or social according as it regards either separate persons or the common good. For they have always unanimously maintained that nature, rather the Creator Himself, has given man the right of private ownership not only that individuals may be able to provide for themselves and their families but also that the goods which the Creator destined for the entire family of mankind may through this institution truly serve this purpose.—*Quadragesimo Anno*, N. 45.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

GUIDE **TO THE DOCUMENTS OF PIUS XII**

By Sister M. Claudia, I.H.M.

•

AT no time in the history of the Church has the Vicar of Christ had such opportunities to make himself heard throughout the world as has the reigning Pontiff. This work makes more readily accessible the directives which he has given to the world during the first ten years of his pontificate. It records in bibliographic form, not only the official pronouncements, but also the allocutions and informal addresses as well as all texts which have appeared in print as official or semi-official publications. Each entry gives the title (the first few words of the original text), the type of document, the date of writing or delivery, and a brief indication of the contents. **\$6.00**

•

At your bookstore or from
THE NEWMAN PRESS
Catholic Publishers
Westminster, Maryland

THE CORPORATIVE STATE

By Joaquin Azpiazu, S.J.

Translated by William Bresnahan, O.S.B.

\$4.00

The learned Jesuit, author of this work, is regarded in Europe as a most reliable authority on the subject of the corporative regime.

Most American readers are not aware of the extent to which corporative forms of economic and social life have developed in several European countries. In view of the likelihood that we are destined willy-nilly to take a hand in European affairs, we shall do well to become acquainted with this organization of society.

The fact that corporativism has in some countries become associated with dictatorship is misleading re-

garding the nature of a corporative regime, which does not include governmental absolutism in its program. With us, the period of ruthless capitalism has been followed by the towering might of organized labor and increased tension between employers and workers. Mutual understanding and cooperation, the calculated fruit of corporativism seems to be the only sound remedy for the growing tension, as it is also the remedy advocated by successive popes. Let us at least familiarize ourselves with its workings and then adopt from it those elements congenial to our temperament and traditions.

At your bookstore or from

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

15 & 17 South Broadway

St. Louis 2, Missouri

*If your work or interests concern
the field of Catholic action—*

- teaching in labor schools or college labor courses
- the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists
- Knights of Columbus, Newman Clubs and other organizations
- parish study or discussion groups
- parish libraries and pamphlet racks

or the field of labor

- Federal, State or local government service
- Union organizing and administration
- labor law
- industrial or labor relations counseling
- labor journalism, public relations, publicity and radio

then you're bound to want additional copies of this uniquely valuable Encyclical Anniversary Issue. You'll find it a source of help and inspiration for a long time to come.

Requests for additional copies are coming in steadily, so we have provided for these requests by an extra printing. We can't tell how long this supply will last, so please don't delay in ordering your copies. Then you'll be sure of getting all the copies you want. Simply fill out the handy coupon below and mail it today.

Prices for additional copies of the October 1951 Catholic Mind are:
1-9 copies 50c ea.; 10-24 copies 40c ea.; 25 and over 30c ea.

CATHOLIC MIND

70 East 45th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Please send me copies of the Encyclical Anniversary Issue of the Catholic Mind (prices: 1-9 copies 50c ea.; 10-24 copies 30c ea.; 25 copies and more 30c).

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

